This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE

HISTORY

OF

INFANT BAPTISM:

IN TWO PARTS.

THE FIRST,

BEING

AN IMPARTIAL COLLECTION OF ALL PASSAGES

in the Writers of the Four First Centuries,

AS MAKE FOR OR AGAINST IT;

THE SECOND,

CONTAINING

SEVERAL THINGS TO ILLUSTRATE THE SAID HISTORY.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

A DEFENCE

OF

The History of Infant Baptism,

AGAINST THE REFLECTIONS OF MR. GALE AND OTHERS.

BY WM. WALL,

VICAR OF SHOREHAM, IN KENT.

THE FOURTH EDITION;

WITH THE AUTHOR'S LAST CORRECTIONS.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR F. C. AND J. RIVINGTON; J. NUNN; J. CUTHELL; J. HATCHARD; OGLES, DUNCAN, AND COCHRAN; W. OTRIDGE; R. PRIESTLEY; SIMPKIN AND MARSHALL; RODWELL AND MARTIN; J. PARKER, OXFORD; AND DEIGHTON AND SONS, CAMBRIDGE.

1819.

BV713
A2V12
v.1

G. Auld, Printer, Greville Street, London.

ADVERTISEMENT

BY

THE PUBLISHERS.

It is rather remarkable that Dr. Wall's History of Infant Baptism, a Work displaying so much recondite Investigation into a subject which has always excited great Interest in the Christian Church, and which still engages much of its Attention, should have been allowed to become so scarce, that, for many years past, the former editions have usually brought four or five times the Price at which they were originally published.

This Work appeared first in the year 1705, and seems to have met with a very favourable reception; for, in 1707, it was republished in Quarto, with some Amendments; — a Third Edition came out in 1720, in two volumes

Octavo, with very considerable Alterations and Additions by the Author; and the same year the Doctor published a DEFENCE of it, from the Attacks of Mr. Gale, an eminent Baptist Minister of that day, and others.

The present Edition has been most carefully reprinted from that of 1720, above-mentioned; the Chronological References made use of in it are retained, and likewise adapted to their corresponding Eras in the year of our Lord; and the Publishers now present it to the Reader strictly as Dr. WALL'S ORIGINAL WORK, without REVISAL, IMPROVEMENT, or ALTERATION of any kind, as it is too common in this age of Revivals, to make those venerable Authors, whose Works were the admiration of our Forefathers, and are also highly valued by many judicious and learned Persons in the present day, appear in a dress or style so different to what they used in their life-time, that many great Men, both Scholars and Divines, were they again to come amongst us, would scarcely know their own Writings.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Every candid Reader will allow it to be highly essential that, in Theological Matters, and especially on Controverted Points, an Author should be permitted always to express himself in the very Words and Manner he himself thought to be best adapted to his Purpose, otherwise his Book can only be said to express the Sentiments of his Editor: which circumstance has caused many modern Reprints to be thrown aside, and their Originals sought after with increased avidity.

The Publishers therefore hope, that as every exertion has been used to render this Edition complete and accurate, it will meet with such Encouragement from a discerning Public as will afford a moderate Remuneration to those who have engaged in this Undertaking.

THE

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

FORASMUCH as the commission given by our Saviour to his disciples, in the time of his mortal life, to baptize in the country of Judea, is not at all set down in Scripture, only it is said that they baptized * a great many; and the enlargement of that commission given them afterwards (Matt. xxviii. 19.) to perform the same office among all the Heathen nations is set down in such brief words, that there is no particular direction given what they were to do in reference to the children of those that received the faith; and, among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the apostles, there is no express mention of any infant; nor is there, on the other side, any account of any Christian's child whose baptism was put off till he was grown up, or who was baptized at man's age (for all the persons that are mentioned in Scripture to have been baptized were the children of Heathens, or else of Jews, who did not believe in Christ at that time when those their children were born); and since the proofs drawn by consequences from some places of Scripture, for any one side of this question, are not so plain as to hinder the argument drawn from other places from the other side, from seeming still considerable to those that have no help from the history of the Scripture times, for the better understanding of the rules of Scripture, it is no wonder that the readers of Scripture at this distance from the apostles' times, have fallen into contrary sentiments about the meaning of our Saviour's command, and the practice of the apostles in reference to the baptizing of infants.

But since the practice of the ancient Christians that lived nigh the times of the apostles, being more largely delivered, is more easily known, — that such as have gone about to give an account thereof out of the ancient records should give so contrary accounts as they do, is a great wonder and a great shame.

* John iv. 1, 2; item iii. 22, 26.

For they do not only differ in the understanding of the meaning of several of the places produced, but also as to matter of fact (whether they be rightly cited or not) do charge one another* with forgery; and are come, as Mr. Baxter complains, to *thou liest*, and *thou liest:* and, indeed, among all the books of controversy between Papists and Protestants, or others that are scandalous for false quotations, there is none comparable to one that is written on this occasion, which I shall at present forbear to name.

Such a thing done by mistake, or for want of skill, is bad enough; but, if it be done wilfully, it is hard to think of any thing that is a greater wickedness; for it goes the way to destroy the common faith of mankind, by which we are apt to rely upon a writer, that, how zealous soever he may be for his opinion, he will not forge matters of fact, nor *speak wickedly* (though it be) *for God*, as Job says †.

Some other accounts also are very partial, mentioning only that which makes for their side, and leaving out parts of the clauses which they cite.

The inconvenience of this is the worse, because it is in a matter which would have a great influence to settle and determine this unlucky controversy, provided that the accounts of the eldest times were given fairly and impartially, and so that the reader might be satisfied of the truth and impartiality of them.

For when there is in Scripture a plain command to proselyte or make disciples of all nations, baptizing them, but the method of doing it is not in all particulars expressly directed, it not being particularly mentioned whether they were to admit into this discipleship and baptism the infants of those that were converted, as the Jewish Church had always done to the infants of proselytes (giving them circumcision, as we know by Scripture, and baptism, as we are ‡ assured by their records) or whether they were to proceed in a new way, and baptize only the adult persons themselves; there is no body that will doubt but that the apostles knew what was to be done in this case, and consequently that the Christian Churches in their time did as they should do in this matter.

And since the apostles lived, some of them to near the end of the first century, and St. John something beyond it, and had in their own time propagated the Christian faith and practice into so many countries, it can never sink into the head of any considering man but that such Christians as were ancient men about 100 or 150 years after that time of the apostles' death, which is the year of Christ 200 or 250, must easily know whether infant baptism was in use at

* More Proofs for Infants' Ch. Membership and Baptism, p. 346.
† Job xiii. 7. ‡ See the Introduction.

the time of the apostle's death or not; because the fathers of some of them, and grandfathers of most of them, were born before that time, and were themselves infants in the apostles' days, and so were baptized then in their infancy, if then that was the order; or their baptism deferred to adult age, if that was the use then: for such a thing as the general baptizing of infants being a rite public and notorious, and in which the whole body of the people, poor and rich, pastors and laymen, men and women, are concerned, cannot be forgotten in a short time, nor altered without a great deal of noise. In a point of doctrine delivered by tradition a mistake may happen; or in the account of some matter of fact done by some particular man; but for a rite of universal concern, a whole church cannot forget it, much less all the churches in several parts of the world, in so short a time. We, Englishmen, cannot be ignorant whether infants were usually baptized in England or not in Queen Elizabeth's days, which is the same distance: the man that thinks this possible, is one that is not used to consider.

It is to be remembered likewise that the apostles, before they died, chose men of whom they had good proof to teach the Churches the same things that they had done; many of whom lived till a great while after the apostles were dead; which makes the time that needs to be kept in memory so much the shorter.

Some pretend to slight this argument as not being a Scripture one; but it is that too by a direct consequence; for since the Scripture promises that the Church shall be led into all truth, *i. e.* all truth that is necessary or fundamental,—to follow the example of the primitive Church must be, by the rule of Scripture, a sure way not to err in fundamentals.

It were (as Bishop Stillingfleet observes * in another case) a great blot and dishonour to the Christian religion, if the primitive Churches could not hold to their first institution not for one age after the apostles; no not the purest and best Churches.

But the truth is, there is no man that does really slight this argument; though those that have no skill in it, or do suspect that it will go against their side, will make as if they did: and therefore you shall see, both on the one side and on the other, those men who, for a flourish, do pretend that they lay small stress on it, as having proof enough from Scripture, yet take all the pains possible to bring this argument to bear on their side, and that so zealously, that they often do it unfairly. There is no Christian that loves to hear or to admit that all the ancient Churches practised otherwise than he does in a controverted matter.

Seeing, therefore, that all the arguments from Scripture for each side have been so searched and so often bandied to and fro, that not

* Unreasonableness of Separation, p. 226.

much more can be said to illustrate them; and that where a command in Scripture is given in brief and general words, the practice of the primitive Church thereupon gives us the best direction for the sense in which it is to be applied to particular cases: and that a great many have desired to see the history of this practice fully and fairly represented, — I have thought it worth my pains to draw up and publish such a Collection as is expressed in the Title.

And if any one ask what there is done in this more than in others that have been already, I answer,

1. That the best collections of this nature have not been published in the English language; and it is for the use of Englishmen that this is intended.

2. That this is more complete than any I have seen; because, among those I have seen, each one omitted some testimonies which the other had; and it is easier for one that collects out of all of them to have more than any one: beside that, no inconsiderable number of these have been gathered from my own reading.

The first and best collection that I have seen is Cassander's, then Vossius, and of late Dr. Hammond's, and out of him Mr. Walker's. The rest are mostly intermixed by those that produce them, with their proofs and arguments from Scripture, and must be picked out: so there are many in the books of Calvin, Bullinger, Featly, Tombs, Marshall, Cobbett, Baxter, Danvers, Wills, &c.

3. I pretend it to be more impartial than the rest; for most of them are collections of such quotations only as make for that side of the question for which they are disputing. And here my readers will say, If those produced by you do make some for one side, and some for the other, they will leave us in the same ambiguity that they find us. To which I must answer, That if he will come to the reading of them with the same resolved impartiality that I set myself to the writing of them, I believe he will find it otherwise: however, the only way to pass a true judgment is to see both together.

4. I have recited the places more at large than others have done; one single sentence, or (as they frequently cite) a bit or scrap of a sentence, gives but a very imperfect, and oftentimes a mistaken account of the author's meaning; but the context added shews the tenor and scope of his discourse.

After all, I acknowledge that there are in the books I mentioned, and others, several quotations which I have not here; and the reason is, partly, because I confine myself to authors that lived and wrote within the first 400 years (though some of them, outliving that term, wrote some of their works after it); and that I do because all men of reading know that from that time to the time of the Al-

bigenses, about the year 1150, the practice is unquestionable; and partly, because many of the Quotations were false, and so altered, that when I came to search the original, there were there nothing to the purpose, or they were out of spurious books, &c. I have been forced to write one chapter of this work * to give an account what sort of Quotations I have left out, and for what reason; and if any one will inform me of any passage in any author within the term limited, which he, after reading of the said chapter, shall yet judge to be to the purpose, I will, if I live to see any more editions of this mean work, put it in, if it seem to me to be to the purpose; and that indifferently whether it make *for* or *against* Pædobaptism; for I desire that this Collection should be as complete and impartial as may be.

When I say in the title, *of all the passages*, I do not pretend but that in St. Austin there are a great many more; but all to the same purpose; for he, in his disputes with the Pelagians, has whole books, wherein he proves Original Sin from the practice of Pædobaptism. In those I have only taken here and there a piece, since every body knows his doctrine.

I have recited the Originals of all the principal Quotations; because, in this matter, writers have so accused one another of forgery, or perverting of testimonies by false translations, &c. that people are grown distrustful. Now they will be satisfied that, if I have mistranslated any thing, I did not do it willingly; for then I should never have added the author's own words for the discovery of it.

I have made Two Parts of this Work. The first contains the principal Quotations, with some Notes drawn from them. I have rejected all the spurious ones; only I have put a few of the most ancient of them together in the last chapter. The two first chapters have no Quotations that speak expressly of Infant Baptism; but of infants being *discipled to Christ* (which must, I think, import their baptism) and of Original Sin as it affects infants; — of the necessity of baptism to salvation; — of baptism succeeding circumcision, &c.; but all the rest are concerning Infant Baptism expressly, either *for* or *against* it.

The other Part contains an account of some Matters proper for the fuller Explication of the Primitive Practice; of which the chief is, the Enquiry concerning the Baptism and Parentage of those who are brought as Instances of Persons not baptized in Infancy, though born of Christian Parents; for which work I wish I had been a little better furnished; yet I think I have rectified some mistakes concerning some of them that had past currently.

---

* Part 2, ch. 1.

I have noted in the Work, after every author, the age wherein he flourished (or began to be a man of note, by writing books, &c.) viz. how many years it was after the apostles time (which I make to end with the year of Christ 100, though St. John lived a year or two beyond it); and this I do, because, during all the apostles' time, every body is satisfied that the Church had an infallible direction.

I think it needful to give the reader notice before-hand, that, in the sayings of the fathers here recited, he will find that, as we, beside the word *to baptize*, do use the word *to christen* in the same sense,— so they used several words to signify baptism. The most usual was ἀναγεννᾶν *to regenerate*; which is also a Scripture word for it; — sometimes they express it καινοποιεῖν, or ἀνακαινίζειν, *to renew*; and frequently ἁγιάζειν, *to sanctify*. They frequently by this word, *the grace*, do mean baptism. Sometimes they call it *the seal*, and frequently φωτισμὸς, *illumination*, as it is also called, Heb. vi. 4; and sometimes τελείωσις, *initiation*. The sense of the places will shew that where the words are of an infant, or other person, *regenerated, renewed, sealed, enlightened initiated, sanctified*, &c. we must understand *baptized*.

I have added a Dissuasive from Schism, or men's renouncing Christian Communion with one another, on account of this difference in opinion; for which I wish I had a vein of speaking more powerfully; for I am fully persuaded, and clearly of opinion, that neither this, nor most of our other differences, are any sufficient or reasonable ground of flying to that dreadful extremity of separation.

One thing I was resolved on, That if I wrote any thing, it should be something which should give nobody any occasion to force me to write again. I said, in the first edition, That if any one would write against this, they should either write against the men that have been dead these 1300 years, or, if they found fault with the Notes that I have here and there made on their words, as not naturally drawn from them, my answer was beforehand, That I would refer it to the readers, whether they be or no.

But I find that I must partake of the fate of writers; only mine has been in the main a much more favourable one than came to my share. It becomes me humbly and thankfully to acknowledge, on one side, that the honour publicly done to my book, and the kind reception it has had from worthy men, has been far greater than I can ever think it does deserve; but, on the other side, a certain anonymous author of a pamphlet, called *An Account of the Proceedings in the Convocation*, 1705, did presently, upon the first edition, give me a rebuke. To which I, in the Preface to the second edition, gave what Answer I thought needful; but that pamphlet being now, I suppose, out of print and forgotten, I do not think my answer to it worth reprinting.

Since the second edition, I have had more adversaries; Two or three, of which, being Antipædobaptists, though they could not charge the Quotations with any falsehood, yet, disliking the consequence which naturally follows from them (which is, that the Christians in the time of those authors do appear plainly their infants) have laboured strenuously, and by different ways and evasions, to enervate that.

One of them has done this in so large an Oration, in such a popular way of pleading, with such wresting of the sense of the places, and in so challenging and insulting a manner, that I have been forced to write a *Defence* of this *History* against their several attacks; but I was resolved that I would not, by mixing such various squabbles, *pro* and *contra*, interrupt the thread of it, but print the Defence separate. If any reader have been moved with any of their objections, and do think it worth his while to see what I have to say in answer to them, I must desire him to look for it there, and not here.

I have in this third edition added some Quotations, which either I have met with in the antients since the last, or which have been communicated to me by learned men; and some few new Remarks. The new quotations do make *for* infant baptism; and if I had met with, or there had been communicated any new ones that had made *against* it, I would, as I once promised, freely have inserted them; but I met with none. There are some passages of Barnabas, of Dionysius Alexandrinus, of Eusebius concerning Polycrates, &c. which Mr. Gale (one of my said adversaries) has quoted and tried to enforce for Antipædobaptism. I have in the said *Defence* shewn them, I think, to be not to the purpose; and as upon an impartial consideration of them, I think they are not, I have not encumbered the History with them.

I conclude with a story told by Cassander *, which he makes long, but the substance is this: — "A man of note among the Antipædobaptists, being told that there was a full agreement of all the antients, who do with one mouth affirm, that this custom of baptizing infants has been in use ever since the Apostles' times, confessed ingenuously, that he did put a great value upon such a consent of the church, and should be much moved with such an agreement of the ancient Christian writers; and that if this could be proved by competent testimonies, he was not so obstinate as to slight so forcible a reason, especially if such authors were produced to prove this, as lived very nigh the Apostles' times; and, therefore, he earnestly desired that the testimonies of this matter should be shewn to him; and having read them, and (as he was a man of good sense) diligently considered them, he altered that opinion which he had taken up from a mistaken understanding of the Scripture; which hap-

* Præfat. in Testimonia de Pædobaptismo.

pened in him, because he was endued with these three good qualities: —

"1. The fear of God and reverence for his word; so that it was by occasion of that zeal for truth that he fell into this way.

"2. Judgment and good sense; so that he quickly perceived the force of an argument.

"3. Modesty and a meek temper, which caused that when he had heard and comprehended the truth, he did not obstinately withstand it." 'To which I shall here add an Advice of Bishop Stillingfleet to his Clergy, * whose Sayings and Advices all people love to hear.' Where the sense of Scripture appears doubtful, and disputes have been raised about it, inquire into the sense of the Christian Church in the first ages, as the best interpreter of Scripture; as Whether? &c.; and, Whether baptism were not administered to infants? &c.

* Duties and Rights of the Parochial Clergy, p. 118.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME I.

		PAGE
Introduction	— — — —	1
CHAP. I.	Quotations from Clemens Romanus and Hermas — — —	35
II.	From Justin Martyr — —	49
III.	From Irenæus and Clemens Alexandrinus	55
IV.	From Tertullian — — —	68
V.	From Origen — — —	81
VI.	From St. Cyprian — —	99
VII.	From the Council of Eliberis — —	117
VIII.	From the Council of Neocæsarea —	119
IX.	From Optatus, Bishop of Milevitanus —	127
X.	St. Gregory Nazianzen, concerning Basil's Baptism — — —	129
XI.	The Doctrine of Infant Baptism —	134
XII.	Quotations from St. Basil — —	165
XIII.	From St. Ambrose — —	176
XIV.	From St. John Chrysostom — —	180
XV.	St. Hierom and St. Austin — —	189
	St. Hierom's Letter to Leta — —	190
	St. Austin's Book, De Sermone Domini in Monte — — —	192
	St. Austin's De Libero Arbitrio —	195
	St. Austin's De Baptismo contra Donatistas	198
	St. Austin's Letter to Boniface —	208
	Ab Genesi ad Literam — —	225
	St. Austin's Letter to St. Hierom —	235
XVI.	From some Councils of Carthage —	244
XVII.	The Decretal Epistles of Siricius and Innocentius — — —	256

PAGE.

CHAPTER XVIII. Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, and another Paulinus — — 268

XIX. From St. Hierom and St. Austin; from Pelagius, Celestius, Innocent the First, Zosimus, Julianus, &c.; and from the Councils of Carthage, Diospolis, Milevis, &c. — — — 277

XX. St. Austin and Vincentius Victor — 380

XXI. No Sect mentioned by the Fathers who denied Infant Baptism — 391

XXII. References to the Books of Authors of the next Age — — 406

XXIII. Quotations from spurious Books; but proved to be ancient — — 411

INTRODUCTION.

The meaning and full import of a rule, given in any old book for the doing of any thing, is not so well apprehended by us, unless we understand the history of that nation and of that time in which the said rule was given; and this holds especially for such rules as are expressed in very short and general words; for it is common for a rule or law to be so worded, as that one may perceive that the lawgiver has supposed or taken for granted, that the people to whom it was given did already know and understand some things which were previous to the apprehending of his meaning; so that it was needless to express them; but though these things were ordinarily known to the people of that time and place, — yet we that live at so great a distance of time do not know them, without an enquiry made into the history of the state of that time, as to those things which the law speaks of; and, consequently, without such inquiry the law or rule that was plain to them, will, in many particulars, be obscure to us; — so, for example, many of the Grecian and Roman laws, whereof we have copies yet extant, would not be well understood by us, unless they were explained to us by such as have skill in the history of the state of affairs in those empires; and so many passages in the books of the New Testament of our Saviour Christ are not rightly apprehended, without having recourse to the books of the Old Testament, and other books wherein the customs of the Jewish nation are set forth, for understanding the state of religion among that people at that time when our Saviour gave his rules.

Another thing that does much help us in understanding the meaning of any such old law that is given in

such short words, is, to observe and learn how the men that lived in or so near that time, that the meaning of the lawgiver must easily be known by them, did practise it; for in what particulars soever we may doubt how, or in what manner it is to be executed, their actions and declarations do serve as precedents to us upon the said law; and this holds especially in such laws as have been in continual use from the time of their enacting to this time.

Now, our Saviour's law concerning *baptizing all nations*, is, as I shewed in the Preface, set down in Scripture in very short and general words; and many people of later times have doubted whether it is to be understood to reach to the baptizing of infants, or only of adult persons. All that have any such doubt, ought to have recourse to the two several helps for understanding the said law, which I have here proposed.

I mean, they ought to learn as well as they can, what was the state of the Jewish religion as to Baptism, at and before that time when our Saviour gave his order for baptizing all the nations; and what we must suppose the apostles did of themselves already know concerning its being proper or improper for infants, which it might not be so needful for our Saviour to express in his new direction to them; — and also they ought to learn as well as they can, how the first Christians did practise in this matter; — whether they baptized their infants or not.

It is the latter of these two things that I have taken upon me as my task to shew; *viz.* how the primitive Christians did practise; and this I do by giving you their own words, without omitting any that I know of for the first 400 years after Christ.

But yet some knowledge of the other point also (*viz.* how the Jews, in and before our Saviour's time, did use to act, in reference to the baptizing of infants) is so very necessary to a right understanding of the words both of our Saviour and his apostles, and also of the primitive Christians; and he that knows nothing of it, is so incompetent a judge of the force of their sayings, that I

think it needful, for the use of ordinary readers, to premise, by way of Introduction, some account of that matter also.

I do not pretend, in this Introduction, in which I treat of the Custom of the Jews in baptizing Infants before our Saviour's time, to do as I do in the book itself, wherein I treat of the Custom of the Christians in baptizing them after it; that is, to recite all the authorities that are about that matter. Partly, because the quotations for that purpose are to be searched for in books with which I am not so well acquainted; and, partly, because those few which I shall produce, will make it clear enough that there was such a custom. I shall, therefore, content myself with reciting such of them as have been already made use of by learned men; such as Ainsworth on Gen. xvii.; Dr. Hammond's Annotations on Matt. iii.; Matt. xix.; Matt. xxiii.; John iii; *item*, Six Queries; *item*, Defence of Infant Baptism; Selden de Jure Nat. et Gent. juxta Hebræos; *item*, de Synedriis; *item*, de Successionibus, &c. Dr. Lightfoot, Hor. Hæbr. on Matt. iii. and John iii; *item*, Harmony on the New Testament, Luke iii.; Jacob Alting. Prælectio 7, de Proselytis; Godwyn's Moses and Aaron, &c.; and the learned author of the Discourse concerning Lent, part ii, ch. 2.

First, then, it is evident that the custom of the Jews, before our Saviour's time (and, as they themselves affirm, from the beginning of their law) was to baptize as well as circumcise any proselyte that came over to them from the nations. This does fully appear both from the books of the Jews themselves, and also of others that understood the Jewish customs and have written of them. They reckoned all mankind beside themselves to be in an unclean state, and not capable of being entered into the covenant of Israelites without a *washing* or *baptism*, to denote their purification from their uncleanness; and this was called *The baptizing of them unto Moses.*

This custom of theirs is fully and largely set forth by Maimonides, *Isuri Bia*, c. 13 and 14. He had been

saying there that the Israelites themselves were entered into covenant by circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice; and then he adds, "And so in all ages, when an *Ethnic* is willing to enter into the covenant, and gather himself under the wings of the majesty of God, and take upon him the yoke of the law, he must be circumcised, and baptized, and bring a sacrifice; or if it be a woman, be baptized, and bring a sacrifice. As it is written (Num. xv. 15) *As you are, so shall the stranger be.* How are you? By circumcision, and baptism, and bringing of a sacrifice; so likewise the stranger [*or proselyte*] through all generations, by circumcision, and baptism, and bringing of a sacrifice. And what is the stranger's sacrifice? A burnt-offering of a beast, or two turtle doves, or two young pigeons, both of them for a burnt-offering.

"And at this time, when there is no sacrificing, they must be circumcised and baptized; and when the temple shall be built, they are to bring the sacrifice.

"A stranger that is circumcised and not baptized, or baptized and not circumcised, — he is not a proselyte till he be both circumcised and baptized; and he must be baptized in the presence of three, &c.

"Even as they circumcise and baptize strangers, so do they circumcise and baptize servants that are received from Heathens, into the name of Servitude, &c.

"When a man or a woman comes to join as a proselyte, they make diligent inquiry concerning such, lest they come to get themselves under the law for some riches that they should receive, or for dignity that they should obtain, or for fear. If it be a man, they enquire whether he have not set his affection on some Jewish woman; or a woman, her affection on some young man of Israel. If no such like occasion be found in them, they make known unto them the weightiness of the yoke of the law, and the toil that is in the doing thereof, above that which people of other lands have, — to see if they will go back. If they take it upon them, and withdraw not, and they see that they come of love, then they receive them, &c.

"Therefore, the judges received no proselyte all the days of David and Solomon; not in David's days, lest they should have come of fear; nor in Solomon's, lest they should have come, because of the kingdom and great prosperity which Israel then had; for whoso comes from the Heathens for any thing of the vanities of this world, he is no righteous proselyte. Notwithstanding, there were many proselytes that, in David's and Solomon's time, joined themselves in the presence of private persons; and the judges of the great Synedrion had a care of them. They drove them not away, after they were baptized, out of any place; neither took they them near to them until their after-fruits appeared."

Maimonides gives at the same place an account of several circumstances of time, place, &c. observed in this action of baptizing a proselyte; as that "They baptized not a proselyte on the Sabbath, nor on a holyday, nor by night, &c. They do it in a confluence of waters, &c. As soon as he grows whole of the wound of circumcision, they bring him to baptism; and being placed in the water, they again instruct him," &c.; — and such a confluence of waters, Jonathan's Chaldee Paraphrase determines ought not to be less than forty of the measures called *Sata*; where he paraphrases on Exod. xxix. — Lev. xi. — and other places.

The Talmud says the same thing of receiving proselytes by baptism; only, whereas Maimonides speaks of the number of three, as necessary to be present at the baptizing. The Babylonic Talmud does not insist on any more than two grave men.

Talmud Babylon. Mass. Jevamoth, fol. 47. "When a proselyte is received, he must be circumcised; and then when he is cured [*of the wound of circumcision*] they baptize him in the presence of two wise men, saying, *Behold, he is an Israelite in all things*; — or if it be a woman, the women lead her to the waters," &c.

But the *Talmud Hierosol. Jevamoth* says, as Maimonides does, that "a proselyte has need of three *;"

* Folio 46, 2.

and directs the other circumstances as he does, *viz.* "They do not baptize a proselyte by night*;" and "They were not baptized till the pain of circumcision were healed†."

The same continues to this day to be the practice of the present Jews; for so Leo Modena, in his history of them (part v. chap. 2) speaking of a proselyte's admission, "They take and circumcise him; and as soon as he is well of his sore, he is to wash himself all over in water; and this is to be done in the presence of three rabbins, &c.; and so from thenceforth he becomes as a natural Jew."

The books do speak of this washing, or baptism, as absolutely necessary; and an ordinance, without which none was to be counted a proselyte; — so *Gemara Babylon. ad tit. Cherithoth*, c. 2. "The proselytes entered not into covenant, but by circumcision, baptism, and sprinkling of blood."

And tit. *Jabimoth*, c. 4. "He is no proselyte, unless he be circumcised and baptized; and if he be not baptized, he remains a Gentile" [*or Pagan*]; and there is in that chapter a proof given of that opinion of the necessity, which I shall have occasion by and by to mention.

Maimonides says the same thing, as we saw in the chapter I quoted before‡.

Also the *Talmud Tract. Repudii*, speaking of Jethro, Moses's father-in-law: — "He was made a proselyte by circumcision and immersion in waters." Godwin, in his *Moses and Aaron*, lib. 1, c. 3.

To the making of a male proselyte, at first, three things were required: – 1, Circumcision; 2, A kind of purification by water; 3, The blood of oblation. *Moses Kotsen*, fol. 20. Of a woman proselyte were required only purification by water and oblation. *Drusius de Tribus Sectis.*

This custom of the Jews continued after Christ's time, and after their expulsion from the Holy Land;

* Fol. 46, 2. † Fol. 41, 2. ‡ Isuri Bia, c. 13.

and continues (as I shewed from Leo Modena) to this day, if there be any that now-a-days do turn proselytes to their religion. Wherever they sojourned, if they found any of that country that chose to be of their religion, they would not admit him, unless he would first be washed or baptized by them; and some Heathen writers do express a great deal of scorn and disdain at this their valuing themselves upon their own purity, in comparison with other nations; — so Arrianus, a philosopher at Rome (about the year of Christ 147) jeers * those that turned proselytes to the Jews, calling them βεβαμμένες, *dipped*; and describes their custom to be, that when a man is so dipped by them, then he is accounted τῷ ὄντι Ἰεδαῖος, *a right Jew*; and calls one that is a counterfeit proselyte to them, παραβαπτιστὴν, *one that puts an abuse upon their ceremony of baptism.*

This solemn baptizing of proselytes differed from the rest of their *divers baptisms* (which St. Paul, Heb. ix. 10, says were customary among the Jews) in this, That those others were, upon new occasions of uncleanness, &c. many times repeated; but this was never given but once to one person. It was called (as Dr. Lightfoot shews †) *Baptism for Proselytism*, distinct from *Baptism for Uncleanness.*

It is not very material to our purpose to enquire upon what reasons or authorities this custom of the Jews, of baptizing all proselytes, was grounded. All that is material is to know that they had, time out of mind, such a custom; and for that, the sayings of their own writers here produced are a sufficient evidence; yet I shall spend a few words in shewing how they prove the necessity of this washing, or baptizing, from Moses's law.

They take notice that Moses (Num. xv. 15) orders thus: — "One ordinance shall be both for you of the congregation, and also for the stranger [*or proselyte*] that sojourns with you. An ordinance for ever in your generations; as you are, so shall the stranger be before

* Dissert. in Epictet. lib. 2. c. 9. † Hor. Heb. on Mat. iii. 6.

the Lord. One law and one manner shall be for you and for the stranger," &c. Now they reckon that the Israelites themselves were, at their entering into covenant with God, at the time of their receiving the law in Mount Sinai, all of them washed or baptized; — so they understand those words (Exod. xix. 10) *And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto all the people and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow; and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third day; for the third day the Lord will come down*, &c. They understand the meaning of that command by which Moses was to sanctify the people on those two days, to be the washing of them; and so that word *to sanctify*, does commonly signify, in the Jewish law (as several writers have shewn by many instances, and I also do in this book * give some) especially when it is spoken of a man sanctifying other men. Maimonides, Mickvaoth, also *More Nebochim*, part 3, c. 33, says, This is a rule, that "wheresoever in the law the washing of the body or garments is mentioned, it means still the washing of the whole body;" and the same is affirmed in *Gemara Babyl.* tit. *Jabimoth*, c. 4, fol. 46; — and so Aben Ezra, on that place of Scripture, Gen. xxxv. 2, where Jacob being to meet with God at Bethel, said to his household, *Be clean, and change your garments*, understands *the washing of their bodies.* Selden † shews by the expositions which the Jewish commentators give on Lev. xi. 25, 28, 40; Lev. xiv. 8, 47; Num. xix. 10, 21; Num. xxxi. 24, and several other texts, where washing of garments is mentioned, that they always understand washing of the whole body; and, for the like understanding of the aforesaid place in Exod. xix. 10, quotes Mechilta, Nachmanid, R. Bechai, Moses Mikotsi, &c.

That they gave this baptism of the Jews, and the command for proselytes to be as the Jews were, as a proof that proselytes must be baptized, appears by the words of Maimonides in the place before quoted; for

* Part i. ch. xi. † De Synedr. lib. 1. c. 3.

he first says thus : —" By three things did Israel enter into covenant, — by circumcision, and baptism, and sacrifice. Circumcision was in Egypt as it is written: *No uncircumcised* * *person shall eat thereof*, &c. ; — baptism was in the wilderness, just before the giving of the law, as it is written, † *Sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes* ; — and sacrifice, as it is said, ‡ *And he sent young men of the sons of Israel, which offered burnt-offerings*," &c.

Then he adds that which I recited before, concerning proselytes : — " And so in all ages, when an Ethnic is willing, &c. he must be circumcised, and baptized, and bring a sacrifice ; as it is written, *As you are, so shall the stranger be*," &c.

And so says the *Talmud. Tract. Repud.* " Israel does not enter into covenant but by these three things, — by circumcision, baptism, and peace-offering ; and the proselytes in like manner."

And again, *ad tit. Cherithoth*, c. 2. " As you are, so shall the stranger be. *As you are* ; that is, as was done to your fathers ; — and what was done to them ? Your fathers did not enter into covenant but by circumcision, and baptism, and sprinkling of blood ; so neither do proselytes enter into covenant, but by circumcision, and baptism, and sprinkling of blood."

Rabbi Solomon, in loc. " Our rabbies teach that our fathers entered into covenant by circumcision, and baptism, and sprinkling of blood," &c.

The ancient Christians, especially such of them as lived in places where they could have converse with the learned Jews, and might learn from them the meaning of the Hebrew phrases used in the Old Testament, do also speak of this baptism of the Jews.

So *Gregory Nazianzen*, Orat. 39, shewing the preference of the Christian baptism before the Jewish, says, Ἐβάπτισε Μωσῆς, ἀλλ' ἐν ὕδατι· καὶ πρὸ τούτου ἐν νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ τυπικῶς δὲ τοῦτο ἦν ὡς καὶ Παύλῳ δοκεῖ, &c. " Moses gave a baptism; but that was with water only ;

* Exod. xii. 48. † Exod. xix. 10. ‡ Exod. xxiv. 5.

and before that, they were baptized in the cloud and in the sea; but these were but a type [*or figure*] of ours; as St. Paul also understands it."

St. *Cyprian*, epist. 73, *ad Jubaianum*: — "Alia enim fuit Judeorum sub apostolis ratio, alia est Gentilium conditio. Illi quia jam legis & Moysi antiquissimum baptisma fuerant adepti, in nomine quoque Jesu Christi erant baptizandi." — 'The case of the Jews, 'who were to be baptized by the apostles, was different 'from the case of the Gentiles; for the Jews had al-'ready, and a long time ago, the baptism of the law and 'of Moses, and were now to be baptized in the name 'of Jesus Christ.'

St. Basil, in his Oration of Baptism, compares together the baptisms of Moses, of John, and of Christ, whose words I shall quote, part 1. ch. xii, of this collection.

Before them all, Tertullian having, in his book of Baptism (c. 5) shewn by several particulars, that the Heathens had used of old a certain rite of baptizing, which they said was for their regeneration, and for the forgiveness of their sins, applies to this observation, — "Hic quoque studium Diaboli cognoscimus res Dei æmulantis, cum et ipse baptismum in suis exercet." — 'Here we see the aim of the Devil to ape [*or imitate*] 'the things of God; since he also sets up a baptism for 'his disciples.'

Now the divine baptism, which, he says, the Devil imitated, must be the Jewish baptism; for the rites of Apollo and Ceres (in which he there instances, as those in which the said baptism was used) were long before the times of the Christian baptism. The place I recite, among some other passages of Tertullian, part 1, ch. iv. § 11.

Mr. Selden (*de Synedr.* lib. 1. c. 3) observes, that *that* saying of St. Paul (1 Cor. x. 1, 2) *All our fathers were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea*, would have been difficult for those to whom St. Paul wrote, to make any sense of, had it not been a thing well known at that time when the apostle wrote, that

the Jews looked upon themselves as having been entered into covenant by baptism; and that St. Paul spoke, as alluding to that; and Dr. Hammond concludes the same *.

Secondly, It is to be observed, that if any such proselyte, who came over to the Jewish religion, and was baptized into it, had any infant children then born to him, they also were, at the father's desire, circumcised and baptized, and admitted as proselytes. The child's inability to declare or promise for himself was not looked on as a bar against his reception into the covenant; but the desire of his father to dedicate him to the true God, was counted available, and sufficient to justify his admission; — so that it was with such a proselyte as it was with Abraham at his first admission to the covenant of circumcision; as Abraham, of ninety-nine years old, and Ishmael his son, of thirteen years old, and all the males in his house that were eight days old or upwards, were circumcised at the same time; so such a proselyte with all his, were both baptized (and circumcised, if they were male children) and had each of them a sacrifice (such as was by law † required for a Jew's child) made for them; but if females, they were baptized, and a sacrifice was offered for them.

The reason which the Jewish writers give, why it was not necessary to stay to see whether the child, when come to age, would be willing to engage himself in the covenant of the true God, or not, is this: —That it is out of the reach of any doubt or controversy, that *this is for his good.* Where there may be any question made whether a thing be beneficial, or not, the concerns of a child are not to be disposed of by another; but here the benefit of being dedicated to Jehovah (of which dedication these rites were the sacrament and seal) is evident and unquestionable. "One may (as they give the reason) privilege a person, though he be incapable of knowing it; but one ought not to disprivilege a person without his knowledge."

* Six Queries on Infant Baptism. † Luke ii. 24.

They judge, therefore, that a proselyte had no more need to expect his child's consent to be cleansed by this baptism, or washing from the unclean and accursed estate in which he was born, than a natural Jew had to make any such delay in giving his child circumcision, the seal of the covenant; which delay, instead of being cautious, would have been impious. This reason of theirs will appear in their sayings, which I am now going to produce: —

Gemara Babylon. Chethuboth, c. 1. fol. 11. "If, with a proselyte, his sons and his daughters be made proselytes, that which is done by their father redounds to their good."

And it is not only the *Gemara* (which, perhaps, some will object against, as not being ancient enough) but the text of the *Misna* itself (which is a system of the traditions and received customs of the Jews, compiled within 100 years of the time of John's and Christ's baptizing, as learned men * have computed the distance) mentions the same usage; for the Misna Chethuboth, both in the Babylonian and in the Jerusalem Talmud, speaks of a child becoming, or being made, a proselyte. The *Jerusalem Misna* says, That if a girl, born of Heathen parents, *be made a proselyte after she be three years and a day old*, then she is not to have such and such privileges there mentioned; and that of the Babylon edition says, That if she *be made a proselyte before that age*, she shall have the said privileges. Both agreeing (as Selden reciting * those places observes) that a child of ever so little age might, by their custom, be made a proselyte; which is also shewn by Dr. Wotton to be a just consequence from the words of that law, which he cites more largely and in the original (*Misc. Disc.* vol. 1. c. 8); and then the *Gemara* there gives the reason, or rather takes off the objection which might be made because of their nonage, saying, "They are wont to baptize such a proselyte in infancy upon the profes-

* Dr. Prideaux's Connections, l. 5; and Dr. Wotton's Preface to Miscell. Disc. † De Synedriis, l. 1. c. 3.

sion of the House of Judgment [*the court*]; for this is for his good."

The *Gloss* there (having first put in an exception, that if the father of the child be alive and present, the child is baptized at his request; but if not, on the profession of the court) comments thus on those words:— "They are wont to baptize." 'Because,' says the *Gloss*, 'none is made a proselyte without circumcision and baptism.'— "Upon the profession of the house of Judgment;" 'that is, The three men have the care of his baptism, according to the law of the baptism of proselytes, which requires three men, who do so become to him a father; and he is by them made a proselyte,' &c. so that, as Selden there expresses it, "A proselyte, if of age, made profession to the court that he would keep Moses's law; but in the case of minors, the court itself did profess, in their name, the same thing. Just as in the Christian church the godfathers do; at least, if their parents were not there to do it for them."

Maimonides, in the chapter I quoted before, *Issuri Bia*, c. 13. § 7, after he has discoursed what I there recited of the baptism of grown persons made proselytes, adds the same that the *Gemara* had said:— "A proselyte that is under age, they are wont to baptize upon the knowledge [*or profession*] of the House of Judgment [*or court*]; because this is for his good."

If a child were fatherless, and his mother brought him, they baptized him at her desire: but the court professed for him; as the *Gemara* says at the place forecited.

Concerning the age of the child to be baptized they had this rule:— "Any male child *of such a proselyte*, that was under the age of thirteen years and a day,— and females that were under twelve years and a day," they baptized as infants at the request and by the assent of the father, or the authority of the court; because such an one "was not yet the Son of Assent, as they phrase it, *i. e.* not capable to give assent for himself; "but the thing is for his good." If they were above that age, they consented for themselves. This Selden shews, both in his book *de Jure Nat. & Gent. juxta Hebræos*, l. 2, c. 2,

and also *de Synedr.* lib. 1, c. 3, by particulars too large to be inserted here.

Rabbi Joseph indeed gives this sentence, That when they grow to years they may retract. Where the *Gloss* writes thus: "This is to be understood of little children, who are made proselytes, together with their fathers;" and the same is the opinion of some people concerning Christians children baptized in infancy; but the Council of Trent anathematizes * this opinion.

What has been said of the baptism of children of proselytes, is to be understood of such children as were born before the parents themselves were baptized; for all the children that were born to them afterward, they reckoned were clean by their birth, as being born of parents that were cleansed from the polluted state of Heathenism, and that were in the covenant of Abraham, and were become as natural Jews. They, therefore, did by them only the same thing that the natural Jews did by their children; that is, for the male children they used circumcision, and sacrifice or offering; and for the females, only a sacrifice.

Dr. Hammond did indeed once maintain the contrary in a dispute † with Mr. Selden and Mr. Tombs; and thought that both the children of natural Jews were wont to be baptized, and also the children of proselytes born after their parents' baptism; but the learned men that have since made a more exact enquiry in the books of the learned Jews, have found and given their verdict, That Selden was in the right, and the Doctor in a mistake, in that matter; and Bishop Taylor, Mr. Walker, &c. have followed him in that mistake.

The natural Jews reckoned, that neither they themselves nor their children did stand in any need of this baptism, ever since the time, which I mentioned before, when their whole nation, men, women, and infants were baptized before the giving of the law on Mount Sinai. It was our Saviour who first ordered, by himself and by his forerunner, that every particular

* Sess. 7. Can. de Baptismo, 14. † Defence of Inf. Bapt.

person, Jew or Gentile, or of what parents soever born, must be *born* * *again of water.*" As for the proselytes' baptism, it was a rule among them, as Mr. Selden shews, † that "it was never reiterated on him or his posterity;" and as other learned men do shew, that *filius baptizati habetur pro baptizato.* 'He that is 'born of a baptized parent, is accounted as baptized.'— Dr. Lightfoot gives this as their rule: — "The sons of proselytes, in following generations, were circumcised indeed; but not baptized —— as being already Israelites;" — and though the child were begotten and conceived in the womb before the parents were baptized; yet, if they (and particularly if the mother) were baptized before it was born into the world, the Jews had a saying, which is quoted by ‡ Dr. Hammond himself, recorded by Maimonides, *Iss. Bia*, c. 13, and also in the Talmud: — "A Heathen woman, if she be made a proselytess when big with child, that child needs not baptism; for the baptism of the mother serves him for baptism."

Thirdly, This is also plainly proved and agreed by all the learned men aforesaid, and by all others, to have been the custom of the Jews: — That if they found any child that had been exposed in the fields, woods, or highways by the Heathens; or if they took in war any infant children, whom they brought home as booty, and intended to bring them up in their religion, they baptized them in infancy, and accounted them as proselytes; so says Maimonides, *Halach Aibdim*, c. 8. "An Israelite that takes a little Heathen child, or that finds an Heathen infant, and baptizes him for a proselyte, behold, he is a proselyte."

At the baptism of such a child the owner of him was wont to determine whether he should be a slave or a freeman; and he was baptized in the name of the one or of the other accordingly. To which purpose is that rule of Rabbi Hezekiah set down in the *Hierosol.*

---

* John iii. 3, 5. † De Jure Nat. et Gent. l. 2. c. 2.
‡ Six Queries on Infant Bapt. § 109.

Jevamoth, fol. 8, 4. "Behold, one finds an infant cast out, and baptizes him in the name of a servant, — do thou also circumcise him in the name of a servant; but if he baptize him in the name of a freeman, — do thou also circumcise him in the name of a freeman."

These cases were very frequent; for, besides that many proselytes of the Gentiles came over with their children, the Jews custom in war was to bring away the children of the people whom they conquered, that they might either make servants of them, or, if they took a liking to them, adopt them for their own; and it was a common thing with the Heathens to expose their infants, whom they would not be at the charge to bring up, in the highways, &c.: so that Dr. Lightfoot says, * "The baptizing of infants was a thing as well known in the church of the Jews as ever it has been in the Christian church."

Now this gives great light for the better understanding the meaning of our Saviour, when he bids his apostles † "Go and disciple all the nations, and baptize them;" for when a commission is given in such short words, and there is no express direction what they shall do with the infants of those who become proselytes, the natural and obvious interpretation is, that they must do in that matter as they and the church in which they lived always used to do.

As now at this time, if an island or country of Heathens be discovered, and a minister be sent out to them by the bishops of the Church of England, who should say, "Go, and convert such a nation, and baptize them," he would know, without asking any question, that he must baptize the infants of those who, being converted, offered them to baptism; because he knows that to be the meaning and custom of that church or bishop by which he is sent. On the contrary, if any one were sent from a church or congregation of Antipædobaptists, with a commission of the same words, "Go, and convert such a nation, and baptize them," he would

* Hor. Heb. on Mat. iii. 6. † Mat. xxviii. 19.

take it for granted that he must baptize none of their infants, because he knows that to be contrary to the meaning and custom of the church that sends him.

When the apostles were sent out to the Heathen nations, with a commission of no other words than these, *Go*, and disciple [*or proselyte*] all the nations, *baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*; — when the case came in hand of the infant children of those that were *discipled*, what could they think other, but that they must do with them as had been usually done in that church in which they and their Master had always lived? Since the nations were to be proselyted, how could they, without particular order, alter any thing in the customary way of receiving proselytes of the nations? — for to *disciple* the nations of Christ, is the same thing as to *proselyte* them to him; and, probably, in the Hebrew text of St. Matthew was the same word; and we see that the customary phrase and language of the Jews was to call the infants Young Proselytes, or Disciples; as I shall shew * that Justin Martyr, one of the eldest Christian writers, calls the Christian infants likewise. If our Saviour meant that the apostles should make any alteration in that matter, and not baptize the infants, as had been usually done, it is a wonder he did not say so.

The Antipædobaptists depend upon this as an unerring rule, That since our Saviour did not say (or, at least, St. Matthew does not recite that he said) "Baptize the infants also," his meaning must have been that they should not baptize them.

If they would put this case: Suppose our Saviour had bid the apostles "Go, and disciple all the nations;" *and*, instead of baptizing, had said *circumcise them*, — an Antipædobaptist will grant that, in that case, without any more words, the apostles must have circumcised the infants of the nations as well as the grown men, though there had been no express mention of infants in

* Part i. chap. 2.

the commission; so that *that* is not always an unerring rule.

What is the reason that, in case circumcision had been appointed for the nations, it must have been of course given to infants, though they had not been expressly named? The reason is this, Because the apostles knew of themselves that circumcision was usually given to infants. If it do appear then, that baptism was also usually given to infants, and the apostles must know it, the same reason would direct them to the same interpretation.

If it had been circumcision that had been ordered, the apostles going out into the nations must have circumcised the grown men at the age that they found them of, — but they would have circumcised the infants also; because one that is to be circumcised at all should be circumcised in infancy, if one has then the power or direction of him; — so they must baptize the grown men among the nations at the age that they found them of; and we have reason to conclude that they must think themselves obliged to give baptism (or order it to be given) to infants also; because by the rules of baptism received in their nation, all that were to be baptized at all, were baptized in infancy, if they had then the power and direction of them.

Though the proof that circumcision was usually given to infants is taken from the writings of the Old Testament, but the proof that baptism was usually given to the infants of proselytes is taken only from the testimonies of the Jews themselves; yet the Jews themselves (how fallible soever they are in judging of the meaning of the law, what ought to be done, or how necessary it was) cannot fail of being sufficient witnesses of the matter of fact, and able to tell what was actually done among themselves.

The difference which the Jews made between themselves and other nations in giving baptism to Gentile proselytes and their children, but not to themselves nor their own children, does not at all affect the question that is disputed between the Christian Pædobaptists and Antipædobaptists; because, in respect of the Christian Religion, the Jews themselves have the same need of becom-

ing proselytes, and of being baptized, that other nations have. The gospel has concluded all under sin; and St. Paul, speaking of this very matter of baptism, says, * That in respect of it *there is neither Jew nor Greek*, *i. e.* there is no difference between them. The Jews themselves do seem to have understood, that when the Christ came, their nation must be baptized as well as others; and, therefore, they asked John (who baptized Jews) *Why* † *baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias?* &c. signifying, that if he had been the Christ, or Elias, they should not have wondered at his baptizing of Jews.

The same thing is to be said of that tenet of the Jews, That the infant children of a proselyte, born to him before his baptism, are to be baptized; but not the children born to him after his baptism, nor any of their posterity in any succeeding generations, they being now looked on as natural Jews.

This I say, does not affect the question of Christian Pædobaptism; because that privilege which the Jew had, or supposed himself to have, above other people, is as to the Christian dispensation abolished; and because both the Pædobaptists and Antipædobaptists are agreed that all persons do now need baptism, as well those that are born of baptized, as those that are born of unbaptized parents,—our Saviour having satisfied Nicodemus ‡ that *that which is born of the flesh* (whether of a Jewish or Gentile, baptized or unbaptized parent) *is flesh*; and *must be born again.* — The Antipædobaptists are satisfied of this. The only question is, At what age must they be baptized? Now, the practice of the Jews, before and in our Saviour's time, was, That all persons whom they baptized at all, they baptized in infancy, if they had, as I said, the power or possession of them in infancy; and in this matter our Saviour gave no direction for any alteration. "He took" (as Dr. Lightfoot § says) "into his hands baptism such as he

* Gal. iii. 27, 28.
† John i. 25.
‡ John iii. 6, 7.
§ Hor. Heb. in Matt. iii. 6.

found it; adding only this, that he exalted it to a nobler purpose and to a larger use."

Some Socinians indeed would have the use of baptism to be abolished in all Christian nations, where the body of the people has once been generally baptized: and do say of Christian baptism, as the Jews did of theirs, that the baptism of the forefathers is sufficient for them and all their posterity. This reason, against the continuance of baptism, which was never thought a reason by any Christians before, Socinus gave about 150 years ago: — "Water-baptism * seems unnecessary for those that are born of Christians, and do imitate their parents in the profession of Christianity. It matters not whether such be baptized or not; and if they be, it is all one whether it be at their adult age or in infancy." Which opinion, or one more against baptism, the Quakers have since taken up; but the Antipædobaptists do hold it necessary, as I said, for every particular person, and not only for a nation at the first planting of Christianity; and it is easy to guess what it was that swayed Socinus into the other opinion; *viz.* his desire of abolishing the doctrine of the Trinity; which it was hard to accomplish, so long as persons were continually baptized into that faith.

There never was any age (at least since Abraham) in which the children, whether of Jews or proselytes, that were admitted into covenant, had not some badge or sign of such their admission. The male children of Abraham's race were entered by circumcision; — the whole body of the Jews, men, women, and children, were, in Moses's time, baptized; after which the male children of proselytes, that were entered with their parents, were, as well as their parents, admitted by circumcision, baptism, and a sacrifice; — the female children by baptism and a sacrifice; the male children of the natural Jews, and such male children of proselytes as were born after their parents baptism, by circumcision and a sacrifice; and the female children by a sacrifice offered for them by the head of the family. Now, after

* Epist. de Baptismo, apud Vossium de Baptismo, Disc. 13.

that circumcision and sacrifice were to be abolished, there was nothing left but baptism or washing, for a sign of the covenant and of professing religion. — This our Saviour took (probably, as being the easiest and the least objectionable of all the rest, and as being common to both sexes, making no difference of male or female) and enjoined it* *to all that should enter into the kingdom of God*; — and St. Paul does plainly intimate to the Colossians (ii. 11, 12) that it served them instead of circumcision; calling it the Circumcision of Christ, or Christian Circumcision.

The baptism indeed of the nations by the apostles ought to be regulated by the practice of John and of Christ himself, who, by the hands of his disciples, baptized many Jews, rather than by any preceding custom of the Jewish nation, — if we had any good ground to believe that they did, in the case of infants, differ, or alter any thing from the usual way; but we have no kind of proof that they made any such alteration. The commission which our Saviour gave to his disciples to baptize in the country of Judea, during his abode with them, is not at all set down, as I said; and what John did in this particular, we have no means left to know, but by observing what was done before and after. There is no express mention indeed of any children baptized by him; but to those that consider the commonness of the thing, which I have here shewn, for people that came to be baptized to bring their children along with them, that is no more a cause to think that he baptized no children, than one's minding that, in the history of the Old Testament, there is sometimes 500 years together without the mention of any child circumcised, is a cause to think that none were circumcised all that while; and whereas it is said of the multitudes that came to John, that they were baptized by him, *confessing their sins* (which confession can be understood only of the grown persons) that is no more than would be said in the case of a minister of the church of England, which I put before, going and converting a heathen nation; for, in a short account which

* John iii. 5.

should be sent of his success, it would be said that multitudes came, and were baptized, *confessing their sins*; and there would need no mention of their bringing their children with them; because the converting of the grown persons was the principal and most difficult thing, and it would be supposed that they brought their children of course.

I shall, at ch. 13, of this collection, shew it to be probable that St. Ambrose does take it for granted that John must have baptized infants as well as others; for he does, by way of allusion, make a comparison between Elias and him; and speaks of Elias's turning the waters of Jordan back toward the spring-head, as a type of the baptism of infants, by which they were reformed from their natural corrupt state, back again to the primitive innocence of Nature; and St. Ambrose does not there stand to prove that any infants were baptized; but speaks of it as of a thing commonly so understood by all Christians; and so Dr. Lightfoot says, on this account, * "I do not believe the people that flocked to John's baptism were so forgetful of the manner and custom of the nation, as not to bring their little children along with them to be baptized."

The same man, who was most excellently skilled in the books and customs of the Jews, says, at another place, † "If baptism and baptizing infants had been a new thing, and unheard of till John Baptist came, as circumcision was till God appointed it to Abraham, there would have been, no doubt, as express command for baptizing infants as there was for circumcising them; but when the baptizing of infants was a thing commonly known and used, as appears by uncontestable evidence from their writers, there need not be express asserions that such and such persons were to be the object of baptism, when it was as well known before the gospel began, that men, women, and children were baptized, as it is to be known that the sun is up, when," &c.

He deduces the argument with great evidence in this

* Hor. Heb. on Mat. iii. † Harmony on John i. 25.

fashion: — ‡ "The whole nation knew well enough that infants were wont to be baptized. There was no need of a precept for that which was always settled by common use. Suppose there should at this time come out a proclamation in these words, *Every one on the Lord's Day shall repair to the public assembly in the church*: that man would reason weakly, who should conclude that there were no prayers, sermons, psalms, &c. in the public assemblies on the Lord's Day, for this reason, because there was no mention of them in this proclamation; for the proclamation ordered the keeping of the Lord's Day in the public assemblies in general; and there was no need that mention should be made of the particular kinds of divine worship there to be used, since they were, both before and at the time of the said proclamation, known to every body, and in common use.

"Just so the case stood as to baptism. Christ ordered it to be for a sacrament of the New Testament, by which all should be admitted to the profession of the gospel, as they were formerly to proselytism in the Jews religion. The particular circumstances of it, as the manner of baptizing, the age of receiving it, which sex was capable of it, &c. had no need of being regulated or set down, because they were known to every body by common usage.

"It was, therefore, necessary, on the other side, that there should have been an express and plain order that infants and little children should not be baptized, if our Saviour had meant that they should not; for since it was ordinary in all ages before, to have infants baptized, if Christ would have had that usage to be abolished, he would have expressly forbidden it; so that his and the Scriptures silence in this matter does confirm and establish infant baptism for ever."

Fourthly, Another thing observable about the Jewish baptism of proselytes is this, that they called such an one's baptism his *New Birth*, *Regeneration*, or *being born again*. This was a very usual phrase of the Jews.

‡ Hor. Heb. on Mat. iii.

Gemara, tit. *Jevamoth*, c. 4. fol. 62, 1. "If any one become a proselyte, he is like a child new born."

Maimonides, *Iss. Bia*, c. 14. § 11. "The Gentile that is made a proselyte, and slave that is made free, behold, he is like a child new-born."

The rabbies do much enlarge on this privilege of a proselyte's being put into a new state, and putting off all his former relations; — those that were akin to him before, are now no longer so; but he is just as if he was born of a new mother, as the Talmud often expresses it; and it was probably from the much talk that they made upon this subject, that Tacitus, the Roman historian (who lived in the apostles' time) drew the notion he had of the Jews practice, in initiating proselytes. "The first thing," says he, * "that they teach them, is to despise the gods [*which they worshipped before*] to renounce their country, *parentes, liberos, fratres, vilia habere*; — to make no account of their parents, children, or kindred."

Some do think that St. Paul alludes to this notion, when he says (1 Cor. v. 16, 17) *Henceforth know we no man after the flesh*, &c. *If any one be in Christ, he is a new creature. Old things are passed away*, &c.; — and St. Peter, when he calls the Christians *new-born Babes*.

The Talmudical doctors do indeed carry on this metaphor of the new birth too far in all reason. They determine that it is no incest for such an one to marry any of his nearest kindred; because, upon his being new born, all former relations do cease, — so that if he marry his own mother he does not sin; but letting pass the vain and absurd consequences which they drew from this figurative speech, it is abundantly evident that the common phrase of the Jews was to call the baptism of a proselyte *his Regeneration*, or new birth.

The Christians did in all ancient times continue the use of this name for baptism; so as that they never use the word *regenerate* or *born again*, but that they mean

* Hist. lib. 5, c. 5.

or denote by it baptism; of which, I shall produce no proof here, because almost all the quotations which I shall bring in this book, will be instances of it.

Now the knowledge of this makes those words of our Saviour to Nicodemus, in the third chapter of St. John, to be much more intelligible to us, where he tells him, that *except* any one *be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.* He used that which was then the ordinary phrase. All that was new in that saying of our Saviour was this:—The Jews knew that any Gentile that would enter the kingdom of God must be born again; but our Saviour assures Nicodemus, that *every one*, Jew or Gentile, must be so born; and when Nicodemus did not apprehend his meaning, but took the words in a proper sense, our Saviour speaks plainer, and says, "That every one must be born of water," &c. wondering at the same time that he, being a master in Israel, had not understood him.

This puts it beyond all doubt that our Saviour is to be understood there of baptism (of which some people, since the disuse of the word *regenerated* or *born again*, for *baptized*, have made a doubt) and also guides us into a ready conception of the sense of those sayings of the ancient Christian writers, where they use the word; and of St. Paul for one, when he mentions *the washing of regeneration.* Tit. iii. 5.

There are some other more plain and gross mistakes made by some men in the understanding of those words of our Saviour to Nicodemus; as that of those who being able to read none but the English translation, where it is worded, *Except a man be born again*, &c. do conceive that they concern only grown men; and that of those who tell us, that, by the *kingdom of God*, in that text, is meant, not the kingdom of glory, but something else. The absurdity of which mistakes will be occasionally shewn in the following collection of the sayings of the eldest Christians, who do very frequently quote this text.

It may be useful to illustrate the point in hand, if we do here institute a parallel between the Jewish and the

Christian baptism, and the modes and circumstances used in each; by which it will more plainly appear, that St. John, our Saviour, and the apostles and primitive Christians, had an eye to the Jewish baptism in many of the rites and circumstances which they used at the administration of the Christian baptism; as all agree they had to the Jewish passover in the ordering of the other sacrament.

1. As there was a stipulation made by the whole people of the Jews just before their baptism (Exod. xix. 5) *If you will keep my covenant*, &c.; — the people answering (ver. 8) *All that the Lord has spoken we will do*, &c.; — *and Moses returned the words of the people to the Lord*, &c.; — and the Lord said (ver. 10) *Go and sanctify them, and let them wash their clothes* [*i. e.* their whole bodies]; and as the Jews did accordingly afterwards require of any that were to be proselyted or entered as disciples to their religion, a stipulation to renounce idolatry, &c. (Maimonides, *Iss. Bia*, c. 13, § 14, 15) and to believe in Jehovah, —

So the Christians required a like sort of stipulation of all whom they baptized; and being taught that all idolatry is *offering to Devils*, they expressed it, *Renouncing the Devil and all his works*, &c.; and to believe in the Trinity; from whence it is, probably, that St. Peter (1 Epist. iii. 21) calls baptism ἐπερώτημα, 'the 'Interrogation or Stipulation of a good Conscience.'

2. As the Jews, though the person to be baptized had before made this profession, yet interrogated him again as he stood in the water; as appears by the words of Maimonides, —

So the Christians required of all adult persons that were to be baptized, that beside the profession made before in the congregation, they should answer to each interrogatory of it over again, when they were going into the water, as I shew in part 2, ch. 9.

3. As the Jews baptized the infant children of such proselytes as desired that their children should be entered into covenant with the true God, — so I have, through all the first part of this work, given the history

of what the Christians did in respect of the infant children of Christian proselytes; and I believe all impartial readers of it will conclude that they did the same.

4. As the Jews required that, for an infant proselyte, either his father or else the consistory [*or church*] of the place, or at least three grave persons, should answer, or undertake at his baptism; and they required the like at circumcision, as Buxtorf, in his *Synag. Jud.* has fully shewn, and is not by any denied,—

So the Christians (as I shall shew at part 2, ch. 9) did the same; putting the several interrogatories of the Creed and of the Renunciations, and requiring the child's answer by his parents, or other sponsors.

5. As such a proselyte of the Jews, when baptized, was said to be *born again*, — so our Saviour, and the apostles, and primitive Christians, gave the same term to Christian baptism, as appears in John iii. 3, 5; Tit. iii. 5; and in almost all the passages of this collection.

6. The Jews told such a proselyte, that he was now taken out of his *unclean* state, and put into a state of *sanctity* or *holiness*. *Iss. Bia*, c. 14, § 14. So the Scriptures of the New Testament do call the baptized Christians the *Saints*, the *Holy*, the *Sanctified in Christ Jesus*; and say, that the church of them is *sanctified with the washing of water*, &c. Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 2; and vii. 14; Eph. v. 26; and it will appear, by many quotations which I shall produce from the ancient Christians, that there is nothing more common with them than to call baptism by the name of *Sanctification*; and to say *sanctified* or *holy*, instead of *baptized*; and to give to persons, while they continued unbaptized, the name of *Unclean*.

7. The Jews declared the baptized proselyte to be now under the wings of the Divine Majesty, or *Shechinah*. *Iss. Bia*, c. 13, § 4.

This was more visibly made good to the new baptized Christians, by palpable signs and effects of the Holy Spirit coming on them; and as the laying on of the hands of an apostle was, in the primitive church, employed to procure this, or of a bishop as the supreme

pastor, when the apostles were dead, for obtaining the more ordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit); so there is good reason to believe that the Jews had before used this ceremony of laying on of hands on this occasion; for it was a thing used by them on almost all occasions that were solemn.

8. The paschal season is known to have been the most solemn time both with the Jews and Christians for admitting proselytes or disciples by baptism. The Jews did then baptize all the proselytes that were ready, for this reason, that they might be admitted to partake of the passover and sacrifices. The Christians observed the same time for a like reason.

9. In the Jews time, some Gentiles were absolute idolaters; some came nearer to the Jews religion, believing their God to be the true God, and were called *Proselytes of the Gate*; — and of these last, some, who declared their desire to be circumcised and baptized, and submit to the whole law, were (for some time before their circumcision and baptism) distinguished from the rest.

In the first preachings of Christianity in Heathen places, some slighted it; — some gave so much regard to it, as to hear at least what the Christians preached; and were called *Audientes*; — some beginning to approve it, submitted to a course of catechising, and were called *Catechumens*; and of these, such as desired baptism, and were now fit for it, were called *Competentes*.

Now, both under the Jewish and Christian dispensation, these men, as they stood in the said different degrees of preparation to baptism, had different places and liberties of access; both among the Jews to their temple and synagogues, and among the Christians to their churches and public offices, as is largely shewn from Jewish and Christian antiquities by the author (whom I mentioned before) of the *Discourse concerning Lent*.

Those degrees of preparatory admission did so resemble one another, that it is plain that the first Christians imitated the Jews in the steps that they made towards admitting a proselyte to baptism. It is true, that some-

times a person was convinced, converted, and believed, and was baptized, all in a short time, as the eunuch, the jailor, &c.; but this was extraordinary; and the ordinary course was as I have said.

10. There were some other customs constantly used by the most ancient Christians at and after the baptizing of any person, which (since they are not mentioned in any command of our Saviour or the apostles, recorded in the New Testament) one might wonder from whence they had them; as namely,

1. When they baptized any one, whether infant or adult, they thought it not enough to put him once in the water; but as his body was in the water, they put his head also three times into the water; so that his whole body was *three several times* under water. This was the ordinary way (but with an exception of sick, weakly persons, &c.) as I shew in part 2, ch. 9.

2. And after he came out of the water, they gave him to taste a portion of milk and honey mixed together.

3. And also they then anointed him with a sort of precious ointment.

The first Christians were too plain men to invent these things of themselves; and yet they were universally used. The books of the second century do speak of them as customs used time out of mind, and of which they knew no beginning. The heretics also of the same time used them; as I shew in part 2, ch. 9; so that the beginning of them must have been from a principle universally received; and this could not probably come but from such like customs used by the Jews at their baptizing of a proselyte. The author whom I last mentioned, shews the probability of this for the two last; *viz.* the *anointing*, and the *milk and honey:* — one a ceremony much used by the Jews; and probably the Jewish proselyte was anointed with the blood of his own sacrifice that he offered; the other, the emblem of the Holy Land, to the enjoyment whereof he was now entitled; and for the first of the three, *viz.* the Trine Immersion, another person, very learned in Jewish customs, assures me, that their way of washing any person, or any thing, that was by

their law to have a *tevillah*, or solemn washing, was to do it three times over; so that a vessel that was to be washed was drawn three times through water; and Mr. Selden says * It must be the same "quantity of water as that wherein a proselyte was baptized;" whence it is probable that they gave the proselyte a trine immersion; and that the Christians, by their example, did the like.

I shall conclude this Introductory Discourse with observing what a weak attempt that is which Sir Norton Knatchbull has made to disprove this custom of the Jews to baptize proselytes! and how unlike to the rest of his Annotations on the New Testament, which are deservedly valued. That learned gentleman seems to have had some disgust against Dr. Hammond, and to have endeavoured to oppose him in several of his criticisms and observations. Such a prejudiced endeavour does often lead men from a true judgment of things into a vein of cavilling. The Doctor (but not he alone, but with him all that ever had any skill in the Jewish learning) had spoke of this custom of giving baptism to proselytes; and he had produced, among other proofs of it, a quotation out of the *Gemara*, which I purposely omitted before, because it must be set down here. Sir Norton picks out † one clause of that quotation, which, taken by itself, might seem to make for his purpose; which is, that "Rabbi Eliezer had said of one that was circumcised, and not baptized, that he was a proselyte." Now see the quotation at large: —

Gemara, tit. *Jevamoth*, c. 4. "Of him that was circumcised, and not baptized, Rabbi Eliezer said, That he was a proselyte; 'because (said he) we find of our fathers [*Abraham*, *Isaac*, &c.] that they were circumcised, but not baptized;' — and of him that was baptized and not circumcised, Rabbi Joshua said, That he was a proselyte; 'because (said he) we find of our mothers, that they were baptized, and not circumcised;' but the wise men pronounced, that, till he were both baptized and circumcised, he was not a proselyte."

* De Synedr. lib. i, c. 3. † Annot. on 1 Pet. iii. 21.

The question here was not Whether proselytes ought, or were wont to be baptized? — but, Whether one that had neglected it, or by some chance had missed of it, could be counted for a proselyte? — and the like question was made of one that had missed of circumcision; and Eliezer's maintaining that one might possibly, without baptism, go for a proselyte, is no more an argument that proselytes were not usually baptized, than Joshua's maintaining that one might, without circumcision, go for a proselyte, is an argument that proselytes were not usually circumcised; so far is that from being a good conclusion which Sir Norton there draws from Eliezer's words, *viz.* "that he did expressly deny this baptism." On the contrary, the tenor of the discourse shews that it had been taken for granted and agreed, that a proselyte ought of right to have both circumcision and baptism; only Joshua had a favourable opinion against the *absolute* necessity of the first, as Eliezer had of the latter, and both of them were also declared singular in such their opinions; so that, upon the whole, this quotation does prove that which Sir Norton Knatchbull brought it to disprove.

I give an account, in the 20th chapter of this book, how one Vincentius Victor maintained a dispute against St. Austin, that a child dying unbaptized, might yet, possibly, be partaker of all that measure of glory which is promised to Christians. From whence a certain late Antipædobaptist raised an argument that Vincentius held that children were not to be baptized; whereas Vincentius's words do, as I there shew, sufficiently prove, that he knew that children ought of right to have baptism; only he puts the case of a child that had missed of it. This argument, drawn from Eliezer's words, to prove that proselytes were not wont to be baptized, runs on the same foot, and is as weak as that. It is certainly one thing to say, A person, though not baptized, might be accounted a proselyte, or a child dying unbaptized may be saved, — and another very different thing to say That either one or the other were not wont, or ought not, to be baptized; so that it is hard to guess what

Mr. Stennet thinks he has gained to his cause by quoting so largely this discourse of Sir Norton Knatchbull in his late book *.

Some objections Mr. Stennet adds there of his own, to overthrow this argument taken from the Jewish baptism; as that "If the Jews practised baptism to initiate proselytes, it must have been an invention of their own; for no such initiation is commanded in the law of God."

But, 1. He may see that they quoted texts in the law of God, for what they did in this matter; — and, 2. Putting the case that they mistook the sense of those texts; yet when they had, upon that authority, established a practice of baptizing proselytes and their children; and that practice had now continued for many ages, — if our Saviour had meant that his apostles, in baptizing proselytes of the nations, should have altered that practice, we have all the reason in the world to think that he would have forewarned them of it; and since he did not, we have reason to think that the Jews were not mistaken in what they did.

Suppose our Saviour had ordered his apostles to require the nations to keep the feasts. If he had meant that they should not keep the *feast of the dedication* (which had no divine institution, but yet being become customary was observed by all the Jews, and even by Christ himself) as well as the passover and the rest, which had been commanded in the law; he would, doubtless, in that case have excepted that; and there is the same reason in the case before us. But that which Mr. Stennet there says, in a challenging manner, to Mr. Russen, who had mentioned this practice of the Jews, "Where does he find that the Jews always did, and do still, baptize infants?—and that, to initiate them into the mysteries of religion?" is too securely spoken. He may see here, as in a specimen, but much more largely in the books of Selden, Lightfoot, &c. to which I have here referred, that they bring full proofs of the

* Answer to Russen, ch. iv.

ancient practice of the Jews in this matter; and that the Jews do still continue so to do, there is no other question, than as it is a question Whether any proselytes do now-a-days either come over themselves, or bring their children to be at all initiated in their religion? — for the books that order the initiating of infants by baptism, are such as the present Jews do own for orthodox and authentic. Sir Norton Knatchbull has one argument which I wonder much at him for using, and at the other for borrowing it of him, because it had been very commonly answered long before he used it; which is, That if baptizing of proselytes had been in ordinary and familiar use with the Jews, the Pharisees would not have said to John, *Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not the Christ, nor Elias?* &c.

If John had been then baptizing of Gentile proselytes, and had not baptized the natural Jews, the Pharisees would not at all have wondered to see converted Gentiles baptized; though the office of doing even that, was probably not accounted lawful for any but such as had a commission from the Sanhedrim; which John, we suppose, had not; and, therefore, they might even in that case have examined by what authority he did it: but the case here was quite otherwise. The mullitudes whom John baptized were mostly, if not all, natural Jews; and the Pharisees and other Jews (knowing that their own nation was not to have any other baptism than what they had already, till the Christ should come, or Elias, his forerunner) looked upon this practice to be in effect the setting himself up for the Christ, or at least for Elias (as he was indeed that † Elias [or forerunner] *which was for to come*); and, therefore, it was that they sent *priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him Who art thou? And that all men mused in their hearts concerning him, whether he were the Christ or not.* Luke iii. 15.

Ainsworth, Lightfoot, Hammond, and every one that has occasion, do shew the easiness of solving this doubt.

† Mat. xi. 14.

The first of these, having largely shewn how common and known a custom this baptism of proselytes was, adds at the end of it,* *Hereupon baptism was nothing strange to the Jews when John the Baptist began his ministry.* Mat. iii. 5, 6. *They made question of his person that did it; but not of the thing itself.* John i. 25.

It is plain that their questions put to John do naturally import no other. They do not ask him What meanest thou? or, What wouldst thou signify to us by this new ceremony of baptizing? — nor any question like that; but, *Who art thou?* And when he confessed (John i. 20) *I am not the Christ*; — they say *What then? Art thou Elias?* &c.; and when he said *I am not* (meaning that he was not Elias in that proper sense that they dreamed of; for they expected that very same person that had been carried to Heaven) they asked farther, *Who art thou? What sayest thou of thyself? Why baptizest thou then* (meaning the nation of the Jews) *if thou be not the Christ, nor Elias?* &c.

All this has nothing in it to evince the contrary, but that the Jews themselves did use before to baptize such Heathens as came over to them; and, indeed, such a pompous recital of arguments, that have been long ago commonly answered, may serve to amuse such as have not read the answers; but it is not fair nor ingenuous dealing for any learned men to use them for that purpose. It brings on the world that great inconvenience of being forced in books to say *pro* and *contra* the same things over and over again.

---

* On Gen. xvii. 12.

THE

HISTORY

OF

INFANT BAPTISM.

PART THE FIRST.

CHAPTER I.

QUOTATIONS OUT OF CLEMENS ROMANUS AND HERMAS.

[In the Apostles' Time.]

Clemens Romanus, epist. 1, *ad Corinthios, cap.* 17.

Ἔτι δὲ καὶ περὶ Ἰωβ ὅτω γέγραπται, Ἰωβ ἦν δίκαιος καὶ ἄμεμπτος, ἀληθινὸς, θεοσεβὴς, ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ. Ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἑαυτῶ κατηγορῶν λέγει· Οὐδεὶς καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ῥύπου, οὐδὲ εἰ μιᾶς ἡμέρας ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ.

'Again of Job it is thus written: — That *he was just* '*and blameless, true, one that feared God and eschew*-'*ed evil*; yet he condemns himself, and says, *There is* '*none free from pollution*; *no, not though his life be* '*but of the length of one day.*'

These words of Job are quoted from ch. xiv. 4, where the English translation is, *Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? — not one*; but in the Greek translation, made by the Septuagint, which was in use in the

times of our Saviour and the apostles, they are as Clement here renders them; and they are accordingly so read by all the primitive Christians; and you will see in the following quotations, that they often from thence conclude the necessity of baptism for the forgiveness of sins, even of a child that is but a day old; and in the next chapter he brings in, to the same purpose, the saying of David, in Psalm li. 5.

Clemens Romanus, cap. 38.

Ἀναλογισώμεθα ἓν, ἀδελφοὶ, ἐκ ποίας ὕλης ἐγεννήθημεν, ποῖοι καὶ τίνες εἰσήλθομεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ὡς ἐκ τȣ τάφȣ καὶ σκότȣς. Ὁ ποιήσας ἡμᾶς καὶ δημιȣργήσας εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἀυτȣ, προετοιμάσας τὰς ἐνεργεσίας ἀυτȣ πρὶν ἡμᾶς γεννηθῆναι.

'Let us consider, therefore, brethren, whereof we 'were made, who and what kind of persons we came 'into this world, — as if it were out of a sepulchre, and 'from utter darkness. He that made and formed us, 'brought us into his own world, having prepared for 'us his benefits before we were born.'

That which I produce these places for, is to shew what the doctrine of this apostolical man was, concerning the pollution and guilt with which infants are born into this world.

Hermas, Pastor, lib. 1, *visione* 3, *cap.* 3.

He having there described an emblem or vision, shewed him by a woman who represented the church, concerning a certain tower built on the water, by which the building of Christ's church was signified, has these words: —

"Interrogavi illam, Quare turris ædificata est super aquam, domina? Dixeram tibi et prius te versutum esse, circa structuram diligenter inquirentem, igitur invenies veritatem. Quare igitur super aquas ædificatur turris, audi; quoniam vita vestra per aquam salva facta est et fiet."

'I asked her, Why is the tower built on the water? 'She answered, I said before that you were wise to en-'quire diligently concerning the building; therefore, 'you shall know the truth. Hear, therefore, why the 'tower is built on the waters: — Because your life is 'saved, and shall be saved by water.'

By this is denoted that baptism with water is appointed the sacrament of salvation to such as are saved; which meaning will more plainly appear by the import of the passage following: —

Hermas, Pastor, lib. 3, *similitud.* 9, *cap.* 16.

He is there relating a vision of the same import as the other; the building of the church represented by the building of a tower, wherein all things are shewn and explained to him by an angel. He sees some stones put into this building that were drawn up from the deep; and others that were taken from the surface of the earth. The first denoting persons already dead; the other, persons yet alive.

Of those drawn up from the deep, he saw first ten stones, which filled one range of building next the foundation; then 25 more, then 35 more, then 40 more; and afterward, in the explication of the vision, he asks the angel, "Lapides vero illi, Domine, qui de profundo in structura aptati sunt, qui sunt? Decem, inquit, qui in fundamentis collocati sunt, primum seculum est; sequentes viginti quinque secundum seculum est justorum virorum. Illi autem triginta quinque prophetæ Domini ac ministri sunt. Quadraginta vero, apostoli et doctores sunt prædicationis Filii Dei. Quare, inquam, de profundo hi lapides ascenderunt, et positi sunt in structuram turris hujus, cum jampridem portaverint spiritus justos? Necesse est, inquit, ut per aquam habeant ascendere, ut requiescant; non poterant enim aliter in regnum Dei intrare, quam ut deponerent mortalitatem prioris vitæ. Illi igitur defuncti sigillo Filii Dei signati sunt, et intraverunt in regnum Dei. Antequam enim accipiat homo nomen Filii Dei, morti destinatus est; at

ubi accipit illud sigillum, liberatur à morte et traditur vitæ. Illud autem sigillum aqua est, in quam descendunt homines morti obligati, ascendunt vero vitæ assignati. Et illis igitur prædicatum est illud sigillum, et usi sunt eo ut intrarent in regnum Dei.

"Et dixi, quare ergo, Domine, illi quadraginta lapides ascenderunt cum illis de profundo, jam habentes illud sigillum? et dixit, quoniam hi apostoli et doctores, qui prædicaverunt nomen Filii Dei, cum habentes fidem ejus et potestatem defuncti essent, prædicaverunt his qui ante obierunt; et ipsi eis dederunt illud signum. Descenderunt igitur in aquam cum illis et iterum ascenderunt. Sed hi vivi descenderunt; at illi qui fuerunt ante defuncti, mortui quidem descenderunt, sed vivi ascenderunt. Per hos igitur vitam receperunt et cognoverunt Filium Dei; ideoque ascenderunt cum eis et convenerunt in structuram turris. Nec circumcisi, sed integri ædificati sunt, quoniam æquitate pleni cum summâ castitate defuncti sunt; sed tantummodo hoc sigillum defuerat eis. Habes horum explanationem."

'But, Sir, What are those stones that were taken out 'of the deep and fitted into the building?

'The ten, said he, which were laid in the foundation, 'are the first age; — the next 25, the second age of 'righteous men; — the next 35, are the prophets and 'ministers of the Lord; — and the 40, are the apostles 'and teachers of the preaching of the Son of God.

'Why, said I, did these stones come up out of the deep 'to be placed in the building of this tower, since they 'had the just spirits before? [viz. *of Justice, Temper-'ance, Chastity, &c. which he had mentioned before.*]

'It was necessary, said he, for them to come up by '[*or through*] water, that they might be at rest; for 'they could not otherwise enter into the kingdom of 'God, than by putting off the mortality of their former 'life. They, therefore, after they were dead, were 'sealed with the seal of the Son of God, and so entered 'into the kindgom of God; for before any one receives 'the name of the Son of God, he is liable to death; but

'when he receives that seal he is delivered from death, 'and is assigned to life. Now that seal is *water*, into 'which persons go down liable to death, but come out of 'it assigned to life; for which reason to these also was 'this seal preached; and they made use of it that they 'might enter into the kindgom of God.

'And I said, Why then, Sir, did those 40 stones 'which had already that seal, come up with them out of 'the deep?

'He answered, Because these apostles and teachers 'that preached the name of the Son of God, dying after 'they had received his faith and power, preached to 'them that were dead before, and gave to them this 'seal; for that reason they went down into the water 'with them, and came up again; but these last were 'alive before they went down; but they that died for-'merly, went down dead, but came up again alive;— 'so that it was by the means of these that they received 'life, and knew the Son of God; and accordingly they 'came up with them, and fitted in the building of the 'tower; and they were not hewed but put in whole, be-'cause they died in great purity being full of righteous-'ness, only this seal was wanting to them;—so you 'have the meaning of these things."

When he says that "the seal of the Son of God is necessary for their entering into the kingdom of God;" and that "*that* seal is water," it is plainly an expression of that sentence or definition of our Saviour, which St. John did *afterward* put into writing, in these words,* *Except a man* (so it is in the English, but the original is ἐὰν μή τις, *except one*, or *except any person*) *be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*

I say *afterward*, because this book was written before St. John wrote his Gospel, as I shall shew; and though Hermas here speaks of the apostles indefinitely, as being dead, it is to be understood of the major part of them; for St. John was not dead.

* John iii. 5.

The passage itself, which represents the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament to stand in need of baptism, and of the apostles preaching the name of Christ to them after they were dead, before they could be capable of entering the kingdom of God, does indeed seem strange to us, and is the oddest passage in all the book; but we must consider it is represented by way of vision, where every thing is not to be taken in a proper sense; yet Clemens Alexandrinus, who lived about 100 years after this book was written, * cites this passage, and takes it for real matter of fact; and those texts, 1 Pet. iii. 19; and iv. 6, which speak of *the gospel being preached to them that were dead*, though they be now by most Protestants understood in another sense, were, by most of the antients †, understood in a sense like to this.

This passage does also lead one to think anew of St. Paul's mentioning a practice of some men in those times being ‡ *baptized for the dead:* — a thing that has never yet been agreed on in what sense it is to be understood. Of the explications that are, I give some account § hereafter.

There is, if we compare this passage with those sayings of the apostles, something like and something unlike. St. Peter, mentioning *the gospel preached to the dead*, if he be so to be understood, makes it to be done by Jesus Christ himself, in or by *the Spirit*; which Hermas represents as done by the apostles after they were dead; and ‖ Clemens Alexandr. by both; for he makes Christ to have preached to the deceased just men of the Jewish nation; and the apostles to the deceased Heathen men. St. Paul speaks of some persons baptized for the dead; but Hermas, in the way of vision, represents the dead themselves, that died under the Old Testament, to be baptized in the name of Christ; and ¶ Origen speaks much to the same purpose as Hermas.

---

* Strom. 6. † Iren. lib. v. c. 31. Clem. Alex. Strom. 6. Origen. c. Cels. lib. ii. Tertul. de Anima, c. 7.
‡ 1 Cor. xv. 29. § Ch. xxi.
‖ Loc. citat. ¶ Hom. in Luc. 14.

Whether these were true visions, or only the author's sense given under such a representation, still the scope of the place is to represent the necessity of water-baptism to salvation, or to entrance into the kingdom of God, in the opinion of the then Christians, *i. e.* the Christians of the apostles times; since even they that were dead before the institution of baptism in the name of Christ, are, in way of vision, represented as incapable of the kingdom of God without it.

Hermas, Pastor, lib. 3, *simil.* 9, *c.* 29.

He having there spoken of martyrs, confessors, and some other degrees of Christians, comes to speak of a sort of harmless people, represented there by the white colour, who have always been as little children; and adds these words: —

"Quicunque ergo permanserint sicut infantes, non habentes malitiam, honoratiores erunt omnibus illis quos jam dixi. Omnes enim infantes honorati sunt apud dominum et primi habentur."

'Whosoever, therefore, shall continue as infants, 'without malice, shall be more honourable than all 'those of whom I have yet spoken; for all infants are 'valued by the Lord, and esteemed first of all.'

This being to the same effect as our Saviour's embracing infants, and saying *Of such is the kingdom of God*, is one of the reasons used to prove that they are fit to be admitted into the covenant of God's grace and love by baptism; and whereas the Antipædobaptists expound our Saviour's words, not of children themselves, but of men that are of an innocent temper, like children; not only that is affirmed here, but it is moreover said of the infants themselves, that they are greatly valued and esteemed of God.

These books of Clement and Hermas, when, after they had, in the ignorant age, lain hid and unminded, they came again into the hands of learned men, were at first

questioned, whether they were the genuine pieces of those authors, and the same that * Eusebius testifies to have been reckoned by many for books of holy Scripture, and to have been read in many churches accordingly; but after so many quotations of them by the antients have been examined, and found to be *verbatim* the same, there is no longer doubt of that matter. They were accounted divinely inspired by some, but rejected from that rank by others. They may, therefore, very well pass for the two apocryphal books of the New Testament, as Tobit, &c. are of the Old; and so they are reckoned by † Eusebius, ‡ Rusinus, &c. The greater commendation is due to the pains of our late most reverend Metropolitan, for putting them and some other of the most ancient pieces into the hands of the English reader; and the more preposterous is the humour of many, that prefer the reading of modern things before them.

I said that these books were written before St. John wrote his Gospel, which may be made appear thus: — St. John lived to 68 years after our Saviour's passion, *viz.* to the year of Christ 101, as is attested by St. Hieron, who says, it in § two places; and in one of them says, "That the church histories do most plainly shew it." And it is certain he cannot be mistaken considerably, because Irenæus, who often recounts how greedily he had, in his younger years, heard Polyarp discourse of St. John and his affairs, and of the conferences he had had with him, says, in several places, ‖ "That St. John continued to the times of Trajan;" and the year of Christ 101, is but the third year of Trajan; and it is agreed by all, that he wrote his Gospel but a very little before his death.

It is true indeed, that St. John seems (chap. v. 2) to speak of Jerusalem as if it were then standing; but many learned men understand these words, *There is at Jerusalem*, &c. that is, *in the place where Jerusalem*

* Eccles. Hist. lib. 3, c. 3 and 16.
† Ibid. ‡ In Symbolum.
§ De Script. Eccl. et lib. 1, *contra* Jovinian.
‖ Lib. 2, c. 39; and lib. 3, c. 3.

was, or in the ruins; as if one had said, During the ruins of London, there is in Cheapside a conduit. —The current tradition is, that he wrote it upon his return to Ephesus, after that violent persecution of Christians in the 14th year of Domitian, *Anno Dom.* 94, remembered by all writers. In that persecution St. John was banished into the island Patmos, * *for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ*; where he had that vision or revelation which he has published, which Irenæus shews to have been in the latter end of Domitian's reign, in these words: — † "We will run the hazard of affirming any thing positively concerning the name of Antichrist [*signified by the number* 666]; for if it had been expedient to be published plainly at present, it would have been expressed by him himself that saw the vision, since it is not very long ago that it was seen; being but a little before our time, at the latter end of Domitian's reign."

Domitian dying *anno* 96, and Nerva, a mild prince, succeeding, the prisoners and banished men were released; and St. John returned to Ephesus, where, as ‡ Irenæus and § Athanasius testify, he wrote his Gospel; and St. Hierom mentions the occasion of it: — ‖ "He, last of all the rest, wrote his Gospel, being entreated so to do by the bishops of Asia, against Cerinthus and other heretics, and especially the then new-sprung-up opinion of the Ebionites, who affirm That Christ had no being before Mary; for which reason he thought it needful to discourse concerning his divine nativity also;" — and this is, as to the main, confirmed of Irenæus himself; for he says ¶ "That he wrote it at Ephesus;" and, that ** "he aimed thereby to extirpate the error which had been sowed in the minds of men by Cerinthus." These things are reported by such men as had the opportunity of easily knowing the truth in such matters of fact.

Now, for the age of these books of Clement and Her-

---

* Rev. i. 9. † Lib. 5, c. 30. ‡ Lib. 3, c. 1.
§ In Sinopsi. ‖ De Script. Eccl. v. Joan.
¶ Lib. 3, c. 1. ** Lib. 3, c. 11.

mas, one need only enquire for the time of Clement's death; for Hermas wrote his while Clement was living, and bishop of the church at Rome, and * mentions him therein as such; and though the time of Clement's death be not so exactly to be discovered from the antients, but that they that have gone about to settle it have varied, and some from others 20 years, yet they that have placed it the latest, have placed it as soon as St. John's death is placed by those that have placed that the soonest, viz. *anno* 101; for in giving that date of St. John's death, I gave the earliest that is pitched upon. St. Chrysostom and the *Chronicon Alexandr.* make him live some years longer.

The two that of late have made the most exact disquisition about the time of St. Clement, are Bishop Pearson and Mr. Dodwell. † Bishop Pearson having found, by undeniable proofs, that the times of Hyginus, Bishop of Rome, are set too low in the chronological tables by fifteen or twenty, or, as some writers place him, thirty years; and that he must have entered upon his office *anno* 122 at the latest, does proportionably set all the foregoing bishops higher; and so he has made St. Clement come into the bishopric immediately after the death of St. Peter and St. Paul, which he places *anno* 68, thirty-five years after our Saviour's passion, and to continue alive till the year 83; and he supposes Linus and Anencletus, who are commonly placed before St. Clement, to have been no otherwise bishops there than as they acted under the said apostles in their life-time.

‡ Mr. Dodwell judges that, after the said apostle's death, which he places *anno* 64, Linus was bishop, and after him Anencletus; but that they both died in a very short time, about a year; and that Clement succeeded *anno* 65, and continued to 81. By either of these ac-

* Lib. 1. vis. 2.

† Pearsoni Opera Posthuma Chronolog. Dissert. 2.

‡ Dissertatio sing. de Success. Rom. Pont. c. 11, 12, &c.

counts, Clement was dead a great while before St. John had wrote any of his books.

But there is a passage in Irenæus (whose authority every one owns to be in this matter beyond compare) wherein the time of Clement's succession, and the distance thereof from the time of those apostles, is purposely insisted on; and that though it mention not the years, yet, as it supposes his entry on that office to be nigher St. Peter and St. Paul's time than some had placed it, so it will by no means suffer him to be placed so early as to succeed within a year or two after their death. It is (lib. 3, c. 3) where he is confuting that plea of the Valentinians (heretics that held that there is another God, superior to him that created the world) whereby they pretended to have this doctrine by tradition from the apostles, who would not write it, nor tell it to every body, but to some more perfect disciples, by whose hands it came to them. The words are these:—

"It is easy for any one that would be guided by truth, to know the tradition of the apostles, declared in all the world; and we are able to reckon up those that were placed bishops by the apostles in the several churches, and their successors to this time, who never taught nor knew any such thing as these men dream of. Now the apostles, if they had known of any deep mysteries which they would communicate to those that were perfect, privately and by themselves, would have taught them to those men sooner than any, to whom they committed the churches; for they desired that such should be very perfect in every thing, and wanting in nothing, whom they left as their successors, delivering to them their own place of government. Since, if these men did well, there would ensue great advantage; but if they miscarried, great mischief.

"But it being a long business in such a book as this to reckon up the successions of *all* the churches; if we shew the tradition left by the apostles, and the faith taught the Christians derived by successions of bishops to our time, in that church which is one of the greatest

and most ancient, and known to every body, founded and built by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul, we shall shame all those who by self-conceit or vain-glory, or by ignorance and mistaken opinion, hold things that they ought not; for every church, I mean the Christians of all places round about, have necessary occasions to come to this church, by reason that the government and power is there [*meaning the seat of the empire*]; and so in this church the tradition of the apostles is always preserved, by means of those that from all places resort thither.

"The blessed apostles then having founded and built this church, delivered over to Linus the office of the bishopric. This Linus, Paul mentions in his Epistles to Timothy. — 2 Tim. iv. 21.

" The next to him is Anencletus.

" After him, in the third place from the apostle, Clement comes into the bishopric, who had both seen the blessed apostles and conferred with them, and had the preaching and tradition of the apostles as yet sounding in his ears; and that not he alone; for there were many then left alive who had been personally taught by the apostles. It was under this Clement that a great dissention happening among the brethren that were at Corinth, the church that was at Rome sent a most powerful epistle to the Corinthians, persuading them to peace, stirring up their faith anew, and declaring to them the tradition which they had lately received from the apostles, which teaches that there is but one God Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, Creator of man, &c.; — and that the same God is declared by the churches to be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (whoso will may see, *ex ipsa Scriptura*) by that Scripture [or writing] itself, and may understand the apostolical tradition of the church; for that epistle is older than they are that now teach these false doctrines, and invent another God above the Creator and Maker of the things that are seen."

He proceeds to name the bishops from Clement to Eleutherus, who was then bishop, the 12th from the

apostles; and to appeal to the church of Smyrna, which had *had* Polycarp; and to the church of Ephesus, which had *had* St. John so lately living among them; and that none of these had taught or pretended to know of any of those secret traditions that these men set up.

Now, when it was for his purpose to shew how near Clement and this epistle of his were to the times of St. Peter and St. Paul, and he says no more, but that Clement had seen and heard them; and that several others were then alive beside him, that had done the like,—he plainly supposes that they had been dead a considerable time; for we never speak so of men that have been dead but a year or two. When we say "There are many yet alive that can remember such a man, and have conversed with him," a stander-by will conclude, we speak of one that has been dead a good while: it may be fifteen or twenty years; and yet even so, if we reckon with * Eusebius and other ancient accounts, that Clement held the seat but nine years, he will yet die before St. John, and before the time when, by all accounts, he wrote his Gospel.

This also is considerable, That Clement, who quotes many places out of other books of the New Testament, seems never to have seen any of St. John's writings;—therefore, though Bishop Pearson has convinced every body that Hyginus is to be placed as he has placed him; yet it seems improbable that Clement should have been bishop so soon as he places him. Rather some years are to be taken from the times of the bishops that were between those two.

For the same reason, I think it very improbable that this Clement was the Clement mentioned (Phil. iv. 3) as St. Paul's *fellow-labourer*, when he was at Rome the first time, six years before his martyrdom; though † Eusebius, ‡ St. Jerome, and Epiphanius do guess him to be the same; for would not Irenæus have mentioned

* Chronic item Hist. lib. 3, c. 34. † H. E. lib. 3, c. 12.
‡ De Script. Eccl. v. Clemens.

that, instead of saying what he does? It was much more to his purpose than to observe the like of Linus, of whose authority he makes no such use.

More improbable it is that this Hermas should be the same whom St. Paul salutes as his acquaintance eleven years before he died (Rom. xvi. 14) though * Origen guesses it to be he; and † Eusebius and ‡ St. Jerome tell us that several thought so; for this Hermas, as he was no young man, because § he had children then guilty of fornication, so he was no very old man when he wrote; because he mentions the ‖ woman that had been brought up with him, as a woman of such great beauty at that time. To conclude men to be the same, because of the same name, as it is very obvious, so it is of little weight.

If they be not judged to be the same, nor to have had any such familiarity with the apostles, but only to have seen or heard them, &c. then that argument falls to the ground of those that say These books are either spurious; and then, Why do we regard them? — or else, If they be counted genuine, Why are they not put into the canon, as well as the writings of St. Luke and St. Mark? St. Mark and St. Luke were for certain contemporaries, companions, and intimate acquaintance with the apostles for a long time of their life. The same is not certain, and I believe not true, of the authors of these books, though it be plain that they lived in the apostles age, and wrote before the death of St. John.

---

* Hom. in Rom. xvi.
† Lib. 3, c. 3.
‡ De Script. Eccl. Hermas.
§ Lib. 1, vis. 2, c. 2.
‖ Lib. 1, vis. 1.

CHAPTER II.

QUOTATIONS OUT OF JUSTIN MARTYR.

[Year after the Apostles 40.]

Dialog. cum Tryphone, page 94, Ed. Steph. 1551.

Καὶ ἐχ' ὡς ἐνδεῆ αὐτὸν τȣ̃ βαπτισθῆναι, ἢ τȣ̃ ἐπελθόντος ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς πνεύματος, οἴδαμεν αὐτὸν ελελευθῆναι ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμὸν, ὥσπερ ȣδὲ τὸ γεννηθῆναι αὐτὸν καὶ σταυρωθῆναι ὡς ἐνδεὴς τȣ́των ὑπέμεινεν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρτȣ̃ γένȣς τȣ̃ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὃ ἀπὸ τȣ̃ Ἀδαμ ὑπὸ θάνατον καὶ πλάνην τὴν τȣ̃ Ὄφεως ἐπεπτώκει, παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αἰτίαν ἑκάστȣ αὐτῶν πονηρευσαμένȣ.

'And we know that he did not go to Jordan, as having any need of being baptized, or of the Spirit's coming on him in shape of a dove. As also, neither did he submit to be born and to be crucified, as being under any necessity of those things; but he did this for mankind, which by Adam was fallen under death, and under the guile of the serpent, beside the peculiar guilt of each of them who had sinned.'

I recite this only to shew, that in these times, so very near the apostles, they spoke of original sin affecting all mankind descended of Adam; and understood, that besides the actual sins of each particular person, there is in our nature itself, since the Fall, something that needs redemption and forgiveness by the merits of Christ; and that is ordinarily applied to every particular person by baptism. In answer to the exceptions made against my translating παρὰ here by *præter*, I have, in a *Defence* which I have been forced to write since the second edition, shewn that all whom I have seen, and I believe absolutely all, who have translated this place, have so rendered it; and that Justin's ordinary phrase, and particularly in this dialogue, is to use it so.

Dialog. cum Tryphone, page 59, ejusdem Edit.

Καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ διὰ τούτου προσχωρήσαντες τῷ Θεῷ, οὐ ταύτην τὴν κατὰ σάρκα παρελάβομεν περιτομὴν, ἀλλὰ πνευματικὴν, ἣν Ἐνὼχ καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι ἐφύλαξαν· ἡμεῖς δὲ διὰ βαπτίσματος αὐτὴν, ἐπειδὰν ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐγεγόνειμεν, διὰ τὸ ἔλεος τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐλάβομεν καὶ πᾶσιν ἐφετὸν ὁμοίως λαμβάνειν.

'We also who by him have had access to God, have 'not received this carnal circumcision, but the spiritual 'circumcision, which Enoch, and those like him, ob-'served; and we have received it by *baptism*, by the 'mercy of God, because we were sinners; and it is 'allowed to all persons to receive it by the same way.'

It is plain that this most ancient father does here speak of baptism being to Christians in the stead of circumcision; and the analogy between these two is one of the arguments used by the Pædobaptists, to prove that one ought to be given to infants as well as the other was. It is to the same sense as is that saying of St. Paul, where he calls *baptism*, with the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh which attends it, *The Circumcision of Christ* (or, as it would be more intelligibly rendered, *the Christian Circumcision*) in these words (Col. ii. 11, 12) *In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him by baptism;* — for by those words, *the circumcision of Christ*, must be understood either that action by which Christ himself, in his infancy, was circumcised; and it is no sense to say that the Colossians were circumcised with that; or else that circumcision which Christ has appointed, *the Christian circumcision*; and with that he says they were circumcised, being *buried with him by baptism.* Only he, as well as Justin, refers both to the inward and outward part of baptism, — whereof the inward part is done without hands; and accordingly the antients were wont to call baptism περιτομὴν ἀχειροποίητον, — 'the circum-

'cision done without hands;' as will appear by some following quotations*; so that it seems hard for the Antipædobaptists to maintain, as some of them do, that the Scripture and ancient Christians do not make any resemblance between these two sacraments.

The paraphrase given of this text of St. Paul, in the *Quæst. ad Orthodox*, ascribed to Justin Martyr, p. 102, is this: — The question there is, "Why, if circumcision were a good thing, we do not use it as well as the Jews did?" The answer is, 'We are circumcised by baptism with Christ's circumcision,' &c. And he brings this text for his proof.

Justini Apologia prima (vulgo 2da) ad Antoninum Pium †.

This holy man and good martyr of Jesus Christ, does in this apology, presented to the emperor and senate in behalf of the Christians, vindicate them from the absurd and abominable slanders which the people raised on them; as that they did in their assemblies eat young children, and commit promiscuous fornication, &c.; and having spoke of their doctrine and conversation, and shewn that they neither believed nor practised any such mischievous things as were reported, he proceeds to speak of the two most solemn rites that they used, viz. of initiating or entering the converts that came to them by baptism, — and of confirming their faith, by receiving the Lord's Supper; and of baptism says thus: —

Ὃν τρόπον δὲ ἀνεθηκαμεν ἑαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ, καινοποιηθέτες διὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐξηγησόμεθα· ὅπως μὴ τοῦτο παραλιπόντες δόξωμεν πονηρεύειν τι ἐν τῇ ἐξηγήσει. Ὅσοι ἂν πεισθῶσι καὶ πιστεύωσιν ἀληθῆ ταῦτα τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα, εἶναι, καὶ βίον ὅτως δύνασθαι ὑπισχνῶνται, εὐχεσθάι τε καὶ αἰτεῖν νηστεύοντες παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν προημαρτημένων ἄφεσιν διδάσκονται, ἡμῶν συνευχομένων καὶ συννηστευόντων

* See chap. 12 and 14. † Prope finem.

αὐτοῖς. Ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται. Ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τȣ̃ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ Δεσπότȣ Θεȣ̃, καὶ τȣ̃ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησȣ̃ χριστȣ̃, καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίȣ τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λȣτρὸν ποιȣ̃νται. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ χριστὸς εἶπεν, Ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, ȣ̀ μὴ εἰςέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν ȣ̀ρανῶν· ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκȣσῶν τȣ̀ς ἅπαξ γενωμένȣς ἐμβῆναι φανερὸν πᾶσιν ἐσμὶ. Καὶ διὰ Ἡσαΐȣ τȣ̃ Προφήτȣ, ὡς προεγράψαμεν, εἴρηται, τίνα τρόπον φεύξωνται τὰς ἁμαρτίας οἱ ἁμαρτήσαντες καὶ μετανοȣ̃ντες, ἐλέχθη δὲ ȣ̃τως, Δȣ̃σασθε, καθαροὶ γένεσθη, &c. — Καὶ λόγον δὲ εἰς τȣ̃το παρὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἐμάθομεν τȣ̃τον, ἐπειδὰν τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν ἡμῶν ἀγνοȣ̃ντες κατ' ἀνάγκην γεγεννήμεθα ἐξ ὑγρᾶς σποράς κατά μίξιν τὴν τῶν γονέων κατ' ἀλλήλȣς, καὶ ἐν ἔθεσι φαύλοις καὶ πονηραῖς ἀνατροφαῖς γεγόναιμεν, ὅπως μὴ ἀνάγκης τέκνα μηδ' ἀγνοίας μένωμεν, ἀλλὰ προαιρέσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης, ἀφέσεώς τε ἁμαρτιῶν ὑπὲρ ὧν προημάρτομεν τύχωμεν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, ἐπονομάζεται τῷ ἑλομένῳ ἀναγεννηθῆναι καὶ μετανοήσαντι ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡμαρτημένοις τὸ τȣ̃ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ Δεσπότȣ Θεȣ̃ ὄνομα, &c. Καλεῖται δὲ τȣ̃το τὸ λȣτρὸν φωτισμός.

'I will now declare to you also after what manner we, 'being made new by Christ [*or baptized*] have dedi-'cated ourselves to God, lest, if I should leave out 'that, I might seem to deal unfairly in some part of my 'apology. They who are persuaded and do believe that 'those things which are taught by us are true, and do 'promise to live according to them, are directed first to 'pray and ask of God with fasting, the forgiveness of 'their former sins; and we also pray and fast to-'gether with them. Then we bring them to some place 'where there is water; and they are *regenerated* by 'the same way of *regeneration* by which we were *rege-'nerated*; for they are washed with water in the name 'of God the Father and Lord of all things, and of our 'Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit; for Christ 'says, * *Unless you be regenerated, you cannot enter 'into the kingdom of Heaven;* and every body knows

* John iii. 3, 5.

'it is impossible for those that are once generated [*or* '*born*] to enter again into their mother's womb.

'It was foretold by the prophet † Isaiah, as I said, by 'what means they who would repent of their sins might 'escape them; and was written in these words, *Wash* '*you, make you clean, put away the evil*, &c.

'And we have been taught by the apostles this word '[*or this reason*] for this thing, — Because we, being 'ignorant of our first birth, were generated by necessity '[*or course of nature*] of the humid seed of our parents 'mixing together, and have been brought up in ill cus-'toms and conversation; that we should not continue 'children of that necessity and ignorance, but of will [*or* '*choice*] and knowledge, and should obtain forgiveness 'of the sins in which we have lived, by water [*or in the* '*water*]. There is invoked, over him that has a mind 'to be *regenerated*, the name of God the Father, and 'Lord of all things, &c.; and this washing is called *The* '*Enlightening*,' &c.

If I am asked To what purpose I bring in this in a discourse of Infant Baptism? — my answer is, That I do not produce it as making directly or immediately either for or against it. He being here to shew that the ceremony of entering proselytes that came to them from the Heathens, had no ill thing in it, had no occasion to speak of the case of infants; — but I bring it,

1. Because it is the most ancient account of the way of baptizing, next the Scripture; and shews the plain and simple manner of administering it. The Christians of these times had lived, many of them at least, in the apostles' days.

2. Because it shews that the Christians of these times used the word *Regeneration* [or, being born again] for baptism; and that they were taught so to do by the apostles; and it will appear, by the multitude of places I shall produce, that they used it as customarily, and appropriated it as much to signify baptism as we do

† Isaiah i. 16.

the word *christening*. They used also ἀνακαινισμὸς or καινοποιία, *renewing*, and φωτισμὸς, *enlightening*, for the same thing; as appears by the first and last words of this passage.

And, 3dly, Because we see by it, that they understood that rule of our Saviour, *Except one be regenerated* [or born again] *of water and the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*,—of water-baptism; and concluded from it, that without such baptism, no person could come to Heaven; and so did all the writers of these 400 years, not one man excepted.

This is of more use to note, because many modern writers use the word *Regeneration*, or *New Birth*, for repentance and conversion, whether it be accompanied with baptism at that time or not; but the antients do not so. The Scripture also uses it for baptism:—*The washing of regeneration* (Tit. iii. 5) is the washing of baptism.

I shewed before, in the Introduction, that this phrase was not first used by our Saviour or his apostles; but that it was a usual word of the Jews, to denote that baptism by which any proselyte was baptized unto Moses.

Justin Martyr, Apol. 1 (*vulgo* 2*da*) *prope ab initio.*

Καὶ πολλοί τινες καὶ πολλαὶ ἑξηκοντῆται καὶ ἑβδομηκοντῆται, οἱ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ χριστῷ, ἄφθοροι διαμένεσι.

'Several persons among us, of 60 and 70 years old, 'of both sexes, who were discipled [*or made disciples*] 'to Christ in or from their childhood, do continue un-'corrupted' [*or virgins.*]

St. Justin's word, ἐμαθητεύθησαν, *were discipled*, or *made disciples*, is the very same word that had been used by St. Matthew in expressing our Saviour's command, μαθητεύσατε, *disciple* [or make disciples] *all the nations*; and it was done to these persons, Justin says, in or from their childhood; so that whereas the Antipædobaptists

do say, that when our Saviour bids the apostles *disciple the nations, baptizing them*, he cannot mean infants; because he must be understood to bid them baptize only such among the nations as could be made disciples; and infants they say cannot be made disciples. They may perceive that, in the sense in which Justin understood the word, they may be made disciples; and Justin wrote but 90 years after St. Matthew, who wrote about 15 years after Christ's ascension; and they that were 70 years old at this time must have been made disciples to Christ in their childhood (as he says they were) about 36 years after the Ascension; that is, in the midst of the apostles times, and within 20 years after St. Matthew's writing.

CHAPTER III.

QUOTATIONS OUT OF ST. IRENÆUS AND CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS.

[Year after the Apostles 67.]

IRENÆUS does in many places speak of original sin as affecting * "all mankind, † all our race," putting them in a state of ‡ "Debtors to God, transgressors, and enemies to him, § under the stroke of the serpent, and addicted to death;" and that it is only in and through Christ that they have ‖ "reconciliation and redemption." He also so speaks of baptism, as of the means or instrument by which this redemption is conveyed and applied to any one, and calls it by the name of ¶ λύτρωσις and ἀπολύτρωσις, *redemption*.

Though this laid together do make an argument for the baptizing all persons, infants as well as others,—yet I shall pass by this and other such places in this and

* Lib. c. Hær. 5, c. 19.
† Ibid. c. 21.
‡ Ibid. c. 16.
§ Lib. 4, c. 5; and lib. 5, c. 19.
‖ Lib. 3, c. 20.
¶ Lib. 1, c. 18.

other authors that speak of original sin, and the necessity of baptism only in general; intending henceforward to recite such only as do more directly and immediately concern infants, and speak of their baptism, either for or against it.

Irenæus adv. Hæreses, lib. 2, c. 39.
Speaking of Christ.

Magister ergo existens magistri quoque habebat ætatem. Non reprobans nec supergrediens hominem, neque solvens suam legem in se humani generis; sed omnem ætatem sanctificans per illam quæ ad ipsum erat similitudinem. Omnes enim venit per semet ipsum salvare; omnes, inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes, et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores. Ideo per omnem venit ætatem; et infantibus infans factus, sanctificans infantes, in parvulis parvulus, sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes ætatem; simul et exemplum illis pietatis effectus, et justitiæ et subjectionis; in juvenibus juvenis," &c.

'Therefore, as he was a master, he had also the age 'of a master. Not disdaining nor going in a way above 'human nature, nor breaking in his own person the law 'which he had set for mankind; but sanctifying every 'several age by the likeness that it has to him; for he 'came to save all persons by himself: — *All*, I mean, 'who by him are *regenerated* [or baptized] unto God, '– infants and little ones, and children, and youths, 'and elder persons; therefore, he went through the se-'veral ages; for infants being made an infant, sanc-'tifying infants. To little ones he was made a little-'one, sanctifying those of that age; and also giving them 'an example of godliness, justice, and dutifulness; — to 'youths he was a youth,' &c.

This testimony, which reckons infants among those that are *regenerated*, is plain and full; provided the reader be one that is satisfied that the word *regeneration* does, in the usual phrase of those times, signify *baptism*;

and this cannot be doubted by any that are at all acquainted with the books of those ages. As for those that are not, I have already had occasion to * refer them to the use of the Jews before and in Christ's time, and to some places of Scripture; and it may be worth the while to turn back to the passage of Justin Martyr last quoted (he lived but 30 or 40 years before this man) and to observe how he uses the word. The reader will also see in almost all the passages that I shall have occasion to produce, the same use of the word constantly observed; that to say *regenerated*, is with them as much as to say *baptized*.

At present, take these three evidences of it:—1. Irenæus himself uses it so in all other places of his book that I have ever observed; as for instance (lib. 3, c. 19) where he is producing testimonies of Scripture concerning the Holy Spirit he has this, *Et iterum, potestatem* regenerationis *in Deum demandans discipulis, dicebat eis, &c.* And again, when he gave his disciples the commission of *regenerating* unto God, he said unto them, *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*;—where the *commission of regenerating* plainly means the *commission of baptizing*.

And (lib. 1, c. 18) concerning the Valentinian heretics, who altered and corrupted both the form of Christian baptism and the manner of administering it (of which corruptions I have occasion to speak particularly hereafter, chap. 21; and Part 2, chap. 5) he says,

Εἰς ἐξάρνησιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως, καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἀπόθεσιν, ὑποβέβληται τὸ εἶδος τοῦτο ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ.

'This generation of heretics has been sent out by 'Satan for the frustrating [*or denying*] of the *bap-* '*tism of regeneration* unto God [*i. e. the true Christian* '*baptism, instead of which, they set up a mock bap-* '*tism of their own*] and the destruction of our whole

* Introduction.

'faith [*or religion*];' and it appears by the following parts of the chapter, that the Valentinians also aped the Christians, in calling their mock baptism by the name of *Regeneration* and *Redemption*, λέγουσι δὲ αὐτὴν ἀναγκαίαν εἶναι, — ἵνα εἰς τὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα Λύναμιν ὦσιν ἀναγεγεννημένοι. — 'They say that it [*their way of baptism*] is 'necessary for all true Gnostics, that they may be *re-* '*generated* unto that power which is above all;' *i. e.* above the God of the Christians.

And (lib. 5, c. 15) speaking of the blind man, whom our Saviour cured by clay and spittle, and bade him wash in the pool of Siloam; and calling this application of clay, and this washing, in an allegorical way, a Creation, or new formation of his eye, and a Baptism, he styles that washing *Lavacrum Regenerationis*, — 'The washing of regeneration;' — and a little after, *Simul et plasmationem et eam quæ per lavacrum est regenerationem restituens ei.* 'He gave to him at 'the same time his formation [viz. *that of his eye*] and 'that regeneration which is by the laver' [viz. *baptism.*]

And (lib. 4, c. 59) disputing against the Ebionites (who denied our Saviour to have been conceived in the womb in any miraculous manner, but thought him to have been begotten by Joseph, in the ordinary way) he asks them, How they think to escape the *generation of death* [or the curse attending the natural generation] if they do not believe that new way of generation which was foretold to Ahaz? [*Behold, a virgin shall conceive*] and so *eam recipiant quæ est per fidem regenerationem.* 'Receive that 'regeneration [*or baptism*] which is by the faith' [or creed.]

This place is mangled in the old copy; and Dr. Grabe shews that the sense requires the words *eam recipiant quæ est* to be restored in the blank; and it is to be noted that the ancient creeds always had that clause of the conception of a virgin, in opposition to these Ebionites; and a common name for the creed was (as Mr. Bingham shews) Πίστις, *the faith.* According to

which faith Irenæus advises the Ebionites to receive their baptism.

As the antients, when they speak of regeneration as applied to a person in this world, do always by that word mean or denote his baptism, — so when they speak of the regeneration of the world itself, or the earth, they mean its restitution or renovation after the day of judgment, which may be called its *New Birth*, or New Formation; and in that metaphorical way of speaking, they sometimes call the resurrection of the body its *regeneration*; so there is one place in Irenæus (lib. 5, c. 2) where, by the *regeneration of the flesh*, one does not know whether he means the baptism of it in this world, or its resurrection in the world to come. He is there disputing against the Valentinians, and all those sorts of heretics who denied either the truth of Christ's natural body and its resurrection, or the resurrection of ours; and says, *Vani autem omnimodo, qui universam dispositionem Dei contemnunt, & carnis salutem negant, & regenerationem ejus spernunt, dicentes eam non capacem esse incorruptibilitatis.* 'They are altogether vain who 'undervalue the whole economy of God, and deny any 'salvation of the flesh [*or body*] and do slight the rege-'neration of it; saying, that it is not capable of a state 'of incorruption.'

By their slighting the regeneration of the flesh, he must mean either their *denying its resurrection*, as many of them did, or else their *refusing to give it baptism*; which several sects of the Valentinians did, who are mentioned by Irenæus at other places which I recite, in part 2, chap. 5. By his making two sentences of it, his meaning seems to be, That they, not believing any resurrection of the body, but that the soul is all that survives, did not think the body worthy of a baptism.

These, and one place more, are all that I know of, where he uses the word, lib. 3, c. 33. He is speaking of Christ at his descent to *Hades*, freeing the patriarchs from that power of death, or *Hades*, under which they had been held; and says, *Primogenitus enim mortuorum natus Dominus, et in sinum suum recipiens pristi-*

nos patres, regeneravit eos in vitam Dei. 'Our Lord, 'being made the first begotten from the dead, and re-'ceiving the ancient patriarchs into his bosom, regene-'rated them to the life of God;'—and a little after, *Hic illos in evangelium vitæ regeneravit.* 'He regene-'rated them to the gospel of life.'

These phrases at this place he means, I think, as a comment on those texts of St. Peter: — *He went and preached to the spirits in prison;* and *the gospel preached to those that were dead;* for that he understood them so, is plain by what he says (lib. 4, c. 45) *Dominum in ea quæ sunt sub terra descendisse, evangelizantem et illis adventum suum,* &c. Many of the eldest Christians (besides Hermas, whose words I gave before) conceived that the gospel of life was preached, and baptism, in the name of Christ, given to the patriarchs in their separate state.

However that be, in all the places where he uses the word *regeneration,* as applied to the case of any persons in this life, he refers to their baptism; which confirms that sense of it in the place I first quoted.

There are several sayings both of the Latin and Greek fathers, which do plainly shew that they not only used that word for baptism, but also that they so appropriated it to baptism, as to exclude any other conversion or repentance that is not accompanied with baptism, from being signified by it [260.] As these that follow.

Greg. Nazianzen, when he deters the baptized person from falling back into sinful courses, tells him,* "There is not another regeneration afterward to be had, though it be sought with ever so much crying and tears;" and yet grants, in the next words, that there is repentance after baptism; but shews a difference between that and the free forgiveness given in baptism.

St. Austin being asked Whether a parent carrying his child, which had been baptized, to the Heathen sacri-

* Orat. 40, prope ab initio, ἐκ ὕσης δευτέρας ἀναγεννήσεως.

fices, do thereby obliterate the benefit of his baptism *? gives this rule [300]: — "An infant does never lose the grace of Christ which he has once received, but by his own sinful deeds, if, when he grows up, he prove so wicked; for then he will begin to have sins of his own," *quæ non regeneratione auferantur, sed alia curatione sanentur*; — 'which are not to be done away by rege-'neration, but by some other way of cure.' These kind of sayings do plainly contradistinguish regeneration from repentance, conversion, &c. except in case of baptism.

St. Hierom [270] discoursing in praise of virginity, has this among the rest, † that Christ was (*natus ex virgine, renatus per virginem*) 'born of a virgin, and 'regenerated by a virgin;' meaning he was baptized by John, that was unmarried. To say that Christ was *regenerated*, taking the word, as many modern writers do, for conversion, repentance, &c. would be an impious speech.

St. Ambrose (*De iis qui initiantur*, c. 4) says, *Nec sine aqua regenerationis mysterium est.* 'There is no 'regeneration without water.'

St. Austin calls the persons by whose means infants are baptized, *eos per quos renascuntur*, — 'those by 'whom they are regenerated;' which would be a strange speech in the dialect of some late English writers, who use the word for the conversion of the heart.

When Irenæus does here speak of *infants regenerated*, it is plain enough of itself that they are not capable of regeneration in any other sense of the word than as it signifies *baptism*. I mean the outward act of baptism, accompanied with that grace or mercy of God, whereby he admits them into covenant, though without any sense of theirs.

I shall, in the places that I must cite henceforward, where we meet with the word *regeneratus, renatus*, &c. translate it *regenerated*, without any farther expli-

* Epist. 23, ad Bonifacium.
† Lib. 1, contra Jovinian, circa medium.

cation; but the reader will find that he must understand by it *baptized*, or else that he will make no sense at all of the place. If any one doubt whether Irenæus, by infants, does mean children before the use of reason, I refer to the *Defence* of my book against Mr. Gale and Mr. Whiston, who have suggested the contrary; and do here only advise the following words to be read, where he mentions the benefit of Christ's example to all the rest, — the *parvuli*, the *juvenes*, and the *seniores*; but says no such thing of the *infants*.

Since this is the first express mention that we have met with of infants baptized, it is worth the while to look back, and consider how near this man was to the apostles time. Mr. Dodwell, who has, with the greatest care and skill, computed his age, * makes him to be born in the apostolic age, viz. the year after Christ's birth 97, four years before St. John died; and that he was chosen Bishop of Lyons, *Anno Dom.* 167, which is after the apostles 67. His proofs are too long to repeat here. So much is plain, that he wrote the book I here quote, within 80 years after the apostles; and that he was then a very old man; for he wrote the two first of his five books against *Heresies* first, and † published them, in which these words are; and he published his third book in the time of Eleutherus, Bishop of Rome; for he ‡ mentions him as then bishop. Eleutherus's time is set by § Bishop Pearson from the year of Christ 170 to 185; but by ‖ Mr. Dodwell from 162 to 177; so that the year of Christ 180 is the latest that the two first books can well be supposed to have been written; therefore, whether we agree or not with Mr. Dodwell, that he was born before St. John's death; yet it could be but very little after, by the age he must be of when he wrote; and besides, he himself says, ¶ as I also recited before, that the revelation made to St. John

* Dissert. ad Irenæum.
† Vide Prolog. lib. 3.
‡ C. 3.
§ Pearsoni Opera Posthuma.
‖ Dissert. sing. de Rom. Pontif. Successione, c. 14, 15.
¶ Lib. 5, c. 30.

in Patmos, was *but a little before his time*; and that revelation was five or six years before St. John died. The learned man that has given the last edition of his works, though he differs from Mr. Dodwell, yet makes him born but six years after St. John's death. Every body that was at this time 80 years old, must have been born in the apostles time. Irenæus's parents must have been born then, if he were not himself.

I shall say no more, but leave it to every body to judge whether it were possible for the church then to be ignorant what was done as to the baptizing of infants in the apostles' time; when many then living, and the parents of most then living were themselves infants in that time; yet this I may add, that Irenæus, though at this time he lived in France, being Bishop of Lyons, yet was brought up in Asia (where St. John had died but a little before) and probably born of Christian parents; for he had, in his younger years, often heard Polycarp (who was St. John's acquaintance, and was * chosen by him Bishop of Smyrna; and was probably that "angel [*or bishop*] of the church of Smyrna" that is so much commended, in (Rev. ii. 8) the discourse of St. John and his teaching. This he relates of himself in his † *Epistle to Florinus*; and he says he remembers the thing as if it were but yesterday; "for (says he) I remember the things that were done then, better than I do those of later times (which is the property of old men); so that I could describe the place where he sat, and his going out and coming in; his manner of life, his features, his discourse to the people concerning the conversation he had *had* with John, and others that had seen our Lord; how he rehearsed their discourses, and what he had heard them, that were eye-witnesses of the word of life, say of our Lord, and of his miracles and doctrine: — all agreeable to the Scriptures."

In an age so nigh the apostles, and in a place where one of them had so lately lived, the Christians could not be ignorant what had been done in their time in a mat-

* Iren. lib. 3, c. 3. † Apud Euseb. Hist. lib. 5, c. 19.

ter so public and notorious as is the baptizing or not baptizing of infants.

It is to be noted, that this testimony of Irenæus, or any other of any of the fathers, is not so much to be regarded as it speaks their opinion or sense, as it is for that it gives us an evidence of what was then believed, taught, or practised by the Church. If he had only signified that he thought fit that infants should be regenerated, it had been but one Doctor's opinion; but he speaks of it as a thing generally known that they were then usually regenerated.

Near the time that Irenæus wrote these his books against heresies at Lyons in France, and therein uses the word regeneration for baptism; and speaks of infants as usually regenerated, St. Clement was Catechist to the Christian auditors at a very distant place, viz. at Alexandria in Egypt: and he also, in all his works, commonly uses the phrase of *regenerate* and *regeneration* to signify or denote the Christian baptism (as I have largely shewn elsewhere); which is a plain evidence that it was all over the Christian world at that time (as it has been ever since till of late) the usual way of speaking; and does confirm the argument taken from Irenæus's words. I shall here recite but one of the places, which is, —

Clem. Alex. Pædagog. lib. 1. *c.* 6. *prope ab initio.*

He is here disputing against some heretics [the Valentinians and some other Gnostics] who affrighted the ordinary Christians; telling them that baptism, as administered by the Catholics, did not put any one into a complete state of Christianity. They said that some of their other rights were necessary. The Valentinians added a great many (of which I mention some, part 2, chap. 5) without which they said baptism in the form mentioned in Scripture, did not make up a complete redemption (as they styled it) nor was the baptized person τέλειος, *perfect*, or perfectly initiated. Against whom Clement arguing, has there such sayings as these:

Ἀναγεννηθέντες ἐν, εὐθέως τὸ τέλειον ἀπειλήφαμεν. 'When 'we are regenerated [*by which he plainly means here,* 'baptized] we then have received the perfection.' And a little after, Αὐτίκα μὲν βαπτζομένῳ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀπ' ἐρανῦ ἐπήχησε φωνὴ μάρτυς ἠγαπημένυ. 'As soon as Christ 'was baptized, presently the voice came from Heaven, 'declaring him the Beloved,' &c. Let us then ask these wise men, Σήμερον ἀναγεννηθεὶς ὁ Χριστὸς ἤδη τέλειός ἐστιν; ἢ ὅπερ ατοπώτατον, ἐλλιπής; 'Was Christ, as soon 'as he was regenerated, perfect? Or will they be so 'absurd as to say He still wanted any thing?' &c.—Ἅμα τοίνυν τῦ βαπτίζεσθαι ἀυτὸν ὑπὸ τῦ Ἰωάννυ, γίνεται τέλειος. 'As soon as baptized by John he is perfect;' Τελεῦται δὲ λετρῳ καὶ τῦ Πνεύματος τῇ καθόδῳ Ἁγιάζεται. 'He is perfected [*or perfectly initiated*] by the washing '[*or baptism*] alone, and sanctified by the coming of 'the Holy Spirit on him.' And a little after he concludes thus:—Ὁ μόνον ἀναγεννηθεὶς, ὡσπερῦν καὶ τύνομα ἔχει, καὶ φωτισθεὶς, ἀπήλλακται μὲν παραχρῆμα, &c. 'He 'that is once *regenerated*, as the name of that [*sacra-'ment*] is, and enlightened, has his state immediately 'changed,' &c.

Here the words βαπτιζόμενος and ἀναγεννηθεὶς, *baptized* and *regenerated*, are all along used promiscuously; and Christ himself is in some of the paragraphs said to be baptized by John, and in some regenerated. And, moreover, Clement says expressly, The word *regeneration* is the name for *baptism*; so that though he do not here speak of the case of infants, yet his use of the word, and his declaring it to be the common use, confirms the sense of that saying of Irenæus, which speaks of infants regenerated.

But in another book of the same treatise Clement himself also does so speak, as to suppose and take for granted that the apostles did baptize infants, or little children, παιδία, viz.

Pædagog. lib. 3. c. 11. prope ab initio.

He is in this chapter giving direction to Christian men and women concerning the gravity and modesty to be used in their apparel and ornaments; and, among other things, speaks of the rings then usually worn on their fingers, and the seals engraven on them. He earnestly forbids all idolatrous and lascivious pictures or engravings; and advises to such as are innocent, modest, and useful; and says thus:—

Let your seal be a dove, or a fish, or a ship under sail, or a harp, as was that of Polycrates; or an anchor, which Seleucus made his choice. Κἂν ἁλιεύων τὶς ᾖ, Ἀποστόλε μεμνήσεται, καὶ τῶν ἐξ ὕδατος ἀνασπωμένων παιδίων. 'And if any one be by trade a fisherman, he will 'do well to think of an apostle and the children taken 'out of the water.'

I was since the last edition, advertised of this passage of Clement by two learned men from distant places of England, much about the same time, the Reverend Dr. Jenkins, Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, and the Reverend Mr. Holland, Rector of Sutton, in Wiltshire; as a passage proving infants baptized by the apostles, which I had omitted. I am something ashamed of myself for not having observed it: for though it be expressed in but three words, and therefore might the more easily be overlooked, yet such transient supposals of a thing, and taking it for granted, are in an ancient author rather plainer proofs of its being then generally used or known, than a larger insisting on it would be.

An apostle's taking, drawing, or lifting a child out of the water, cannot refer to any thing that I can think of, but the baptizing of it. And *infantem de fonte levare*, is a phrase used by the antients, denoting the baptizing of it, almost as commonly as the word baptizing itself. And as the emblem of an anchor, or of a ship under sail, used for the impress of a seal-ring, does suppose those things to be commonly seen, known, and used, — so St. Clement's advising the emblem of an apostle bap-

tizing an infant to be used by the Christians in his time (which was but about 90 years after the apostles) for the sculpture of their seals, does suppose it commonly known by them that the apostles did perform that office.

I do not find either by any suggestion of the foresaid learned men, or by any search that I have been able to make, that there is in the editions or manuscript copies any variety in the reading of this place; nor that any commentator has understood it in any other sense. Gentianus Hervetus gives (as Dr. Jenkins has been pleased to inform me) this comment upon it:—

"Si insculpatur autem in gemmâ signum piscantis; Meminerit, inquit, qui gestat annulum, Petri quem Christus fecit piscatorem hominum; et puerorum qui baptizati ex aquæ lavacro, seu piscinâ extrahuntur."

'If there be engraved in a seal-ring the picture of a 'fisherman [*or rather as Clement's own words are, If 'a fisherman will have an engraving on his seal*] let 'him think of St. Peter, whom Christ made a fisher of 'men; and of the children which, when baptized, are 'drawn out of a laver of water as out of a fish-pool.'

Whether there be now remaining any memoir of any such emblem as this used by the Christians in their seals, I know not. But there is proof that in very ancient times they used this very sculpture on their font-stones: for there is at Bridekirk, in Cumberland, a font-stone so ancient, that Cambden confesses he could not read the inscription on it, nor guess what was meant by several little images, which were, as he says, curiously engraven on it. But the Bishop of ——, Dr. Nicholson, late Bishop of Carlisle, has explained the inscription; and by the imagery, he says, There is fairly represented a person in a long sacerdotal habit dipping a child into the water; and a dove, the emblem, no doubt, of the Holy Ghost, hovering over the infant, &c. This I took notice of in my former editions, part 2, chap. 2.

But I did not then know that St. Clement had advised such a sculpture for seals.

CHAPTER IV.

QUOTATIONS OUT OF TERTULLIAN.

[Year after the Apostles 100.]

TERTULLIAN and Origen being the two next that have said any thing of this matter, their character is such as requires something to be said of it. They were both of them very learned men; but both inclined to be singular in their opinions, and accordingly both fell into great and monstrous errors in the faith.

The first fell into the heresy of the Montanists, who blasphemously held that one Montanus was that paraclete or comforter which our Saviour promised to send; and that better and fuller discoveries of God's will were made to him than to the apostles, who prophesied only in part. He commonly calls the Catholics, *Psychichos*, 'the carnal men.' And he afterward forsook the Montanists too, and set up a new sect of his own, called * Tertullianists; some remainders of which sect continued at Carthage till St. Austin's time; and he had the happiness to convert the last of them, and to get them to give up their church or place of worship to the Catholics.

The other, being a great Platonist, taught the preexistence of souls; that the souls of all men had a former being before the world, and had sinned in that former state, and were sent hither into bodies as a punishment: and he † derived original sin from thence, which the Scripture derives from the fall of Adam. He had also other errors about the resurrection and the future state, &c.: so that ‡ St. Hierom, giving advice to Tranquilinus of the caution wherewith one must read Origen's works, says, "My opinion is, that Origen is sometimes to be read because of his learning, but so as we

* Augustin. de Hæresibus, c. 26 et 86. † Aug. de Civit. Dei, l. 11, c. 23. ‡ Ep. ad Tranquilinum 76.

read Tertullian, Arnobius, Apollinaris, and some other ecclesiastical writers, both Greek and Latin, taking care to choose the good that is in them, and avoid the contrary."

As for the occasion I have here to quote them, the rule I mentioned before is chiefly to be minded; that so far as they do, as historians, give us an account of the faith and practice of the church in their times, their testimony is considerable; but where either of them has any particular opinion of his own, it is not of any great authority.

Tertullian has spoke so in this matter of infant baptism, as that it is hard to reconcile the several passages with one another. The reader shall have the particulars:—

Tertullianus de Baptismo, c. 10.

Having spoken of the matter of baptism, water, and the form of it, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, he adds,—

"Diximus quantum mediocritati nostræ licuit de universis quæ baptismi religionem struunt: nunc ad reliquum statum ejus teque ut potero progrediar de quæstiunculis quibusdam."

'I have, according to my mean ability, discoursed of 'all things that make up the religion [*or essence*] of 'baptism: now I will proceed to speak of some lesser 'questions about the other state thereof.'

Afterward, *c.* 12, 13.

"Quum vero præscribitur nemini sine baptismo competere salutem, ex illâ maximè pronunciatione Domini, qui ait; nisi natus ex aquâ quis erit, non habet salutem: suboriuntur scrupuli, imo temerarii tractatus quorundam, quomodo ex ista præscriptione Apostolis salus competat, quos tinctos non invenimus in Domino, præter Paulum: imo cum Paulus solus ex illis baptismum Christi induerit, aut præjudicatum esse de cæterorum

periculo, qui careant aqua Christi, ut præscriptio salva sit: aut rescindi præscriptionem, si etiam non tinctis salus statuta est. Audivi (Domino Teste) ejusmodi: ne quis me tam perditum existimet, ut ultro exagitem libidine styli quæ aliis scrupulum incutiant. Et nunc illis, ut potero, respondebo qui negant apostolos tinctos. Nam si humanum Johannis baptismum inierant et Dominicum desiderabant (quatenus unum baptismum definierat ipse Dominus, dicens Petro perfundi volenti; qui semel lavit non habet necesse rursum; quod utique non tincto omnino non dixisset) et hæc est probatio exerta adversus illos qui adimunt apostolis etiam Johannis baptismum, ut destruant aquæ sacramentum — *paulo post* — Hic ergo scelestissimi illi provocant quæstiones: adeo dicunt, baptismus necessarius non est, quibus fides satis est; nam et Abraham nullius aquæ nisi fidei sacramento Deo placuit.

"Sed in omnibus posteriora concludunt, et sequentia antecedentibus prævalent. Fuerit salus retro per fidem nudam ante Domini passionem et resurrectionem; at ubi fides aucta est credendi in nativitatem, passionem, resurrectionemque ejus; addita est ampliatio sacramento, obsignatio baptismi, vestimentum quodammodo fidei, quæ retro erat nuda, nec potest jam [esse] sine sua lege. Lex enim tinguendi imposita est et forma præscripta; ite, inquit, docete nationes, tinguentes eas in nomen patris, et filij, et spiritus sancti. Huic legi collata definitio illa, nisi quis renatus fuerit ex Aqua et Spiritu non intrabit in regnum cœlorum; obstrinxit fidem ad baptismi necessitatem. Itaque omnes exinde credentes tinguebantur," &c.

'Whereas it is an acknowledged rule, that none can
' be saved without baptism; grounded especially on that
' sentence of our Lord, *Unless one be born of water,*
' *he cannot be saved*. Some scruples do arise, and even
' rash discourses of some men; how, according to that
' rule, the apostles could be saved, whom we do not find
' to have been baptized with our Lord's baptism, ex-

'cept Paul; and when Paul only of them had the bap-
'tism of Christ, either the rest who wanted this water
'of Christ must be supposed in a dangerous condition,
'that so the rule may stand fast; or else the rule is
'broken if any persons not baptized can be saved. I
'have heard some men (God is my witness) talk at this
'rate, and would have no body think me so lewd as,
'by the itch of my pen, to raise questions purposely,
'which may cause scruples in other men.

'I will here give an answer, as well as I can, to those
'men that deny the apostles to have been baptized;
'for if they received only the baptism of John as of a
'man, and had not that of our Lord (inasmuch as our
'Lord himself had determined that there is to be but
'one baptism, saying to Peter, when he desired to be
'washed, *He that has been once washed has no need*
'*again*; which he would not have said to one that had
'not been washed at all) even this is a plain proof
'against those who take away from the apostles, even
'the baptism of John, that they may abolish as needless
'the sacrament of water; and a little after,—here again
'these impious men raise cavils, and say, "Baptism is
'not necessary for those that have faith, which is suffi-
'cient; for Abraham, without any sacrament of water,
'but of faith only, pleased God.

'But in all matters the later injunctions bind; and the
'following rules take place above those that were before.
'Though, there were salvation formerly by bare faith be-
'fore our Lord's passion and resurrection; yet when the
'faith is enlarged to believe in his nativity, passion,
'and resurrection, there is an enlargement of the sacra-
'ment, the sealing of baptism, as it were a garment to
'our faith; which formerly was bare, but cannot now
'be without its law; for the law of baptizing is given,
'and the form of it appointed. *Go*, says he, *teach the*
'*nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father,*
'*and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*; and when
'to this law that rule is added, *Except one be regene-*
'*rated of water and the Spirit, he shall not enter into*

'*the kingdom of Heaven*, it has bound up faith to a 'necessity of baptism; and, therefore, all believers 'from thenceforward were baptized,' &c.

And afterward, c. 17.

Having said that it is not absolutely unlawful for laymen to baptize, he adds,

"Sed quanto magis laicis disciplina verecundiæ et modestiæ incumbit, cum ea majoribus competant, ne sibi adsumant dicatum episcopis officium episcopatus? Æmulatio schismatum mater est. Omnia licere dixit sanctissimus apostolus, sed non omnia expedire. Sufficiat scilicet in necessitatibus utaris, sicubi aut loci aut temporis aut personæ conditio compellit. Tunc enim constantia succurrentis excipitur cum urget circumstantia periclitantis. Quoniam reus erit perditi hominis, si supersederit præstare quod liberè potuit."

'But how much more necessary for laymen is it to 'keep the rules of humility and modesty, that since 'these things belong to men of higher order, they do 'not arrogate to themselves the office of the bishops, 'that is proper to them? Emulation is the mother of 'Schism. The most blessed apostle said, That all 'things were lawful, but all things were not expedient. 'Let it suffice, that thou make use of this power in 'cases of necessity, — when the circumstance either 'of the place, or of the time, or of the person requires 'it; for then the adventuring to help is well taken, 'when the condition of a person in danger forces one 'to it; because he that shall neglect at such a time to 'do what he lawfully may, will be guilty of the person's 'perdition' [*or damnation.*]

Let the reader mind how all this is to be reconciled with what he says afterward, c. 18; —

"Cæterum baptismum non temerè credendum esse sciant quorum officium est. Omni petentite dato, suum habet titulum, proinde ad eleemosynam pertinentem.

Imo illud potius perspiciendum, nolite dare sanctum canibus, et porcis projicere margarita vestra; et manus ne facile imposueris, ne participes aliena delicta. Itaque pro cujusque personæ conditione ac dispositione, etiam ætate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est; præcipuè tamen circa parvulos. Quid enim necesse est [ ] sponsores etiam periculo ingeri? — quia et ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt, et proventu malæ indolis falli. Ait quidem Dominus, nolite illos prohibere ad me venire. Veniant ergo dum adolescunt, veniant dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur; fiant Christiani quum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum? Cautius agetur in secularibus, ut cui substantia terrena non creditur, divina credatur. Norint petere salutem, ut petenti dedisse videaris. Non minori de causa innupti quoque procrastinandi, in quibus tentatio præparata est, tam virginibus per maturitatem, quam viduis per vacationem, donec aut nubant aut continentiæ corroborentur. Si qui pondus intelligant baptismi, magis timebunt consecutionem quam dilationem. Fides integra secura est de salute.

"Diem baptismo solemniorem Pascha præstat; cum et passio Domini in quam tingimur, adimpleta est," &c.

'But they whose duty it is to administer baptism, are 'to know that it must not be given rashly. '*Give to* '*every one that asketh thee*, has its proper subject, and 'relates to almsgiving; but that command rather is 'here to be considered, *Give not that which is holy to* '*dogs, neither cast your pearls before swine;* — and 'that, *lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be par-* '*taker of other men's faults;* — therefore, according to 'every one's condition and disposition, and also their 'age, the delaying of baptism is more profitable, espe- 'cially in the case of little children; — for what need is 'there [ ] that the godfathers should be brought 'into danger? — because they may either fail of their 'promises by death, or they may be mistaken by a 'child's proving of wicked disposition. Our Lord says,

'indeed, *Do not forbid them to come unto me*, therefore let them come when they are grown up; let them come when they understand, — when they are instructed whither it is that they come; let them be made Christians when they can know Christ. What need their *guiltless* age make such haste to the forgiveness of sins? Men will proceed more warily in worldly things; and he that should not have earthly goods committed to him, yet shall have heavenly. Let them know how to desire this salvation, that you may appear to have given to one that asketh.

'For no less reason unmarried persons ought to be kept off, who are likely to come into temptation, — as well those that never were married, upon account of their coming to ripeness, — as those in widowhood, for the miss of their partner, until they either marry or be confirmed in continence. They that understand the weight of baptism, will rather dread the receiving it than the delaying of it. An entire faith is secure of salvation.

'The most solemn time of baptism is Easter; at which time the passion of our Lord, into which we are baptized, was fulfilled,' &c.

Let there be also compared with this, what he says in another book: —

Tertullianus de Anima, c. 39, 40.

"Adeo nulla ferè nativitas munda est, utique Ethnicorum. Hinc enim et apostolus ex sanctificato alterutrŏ sexu sanctos procreari ait; tam ex feminis prærogativâ quam ex institutionis disciplinâ; cæterum, inquit, immundi nascerentur. Quasi designatos tamen sanctitati, ac per hoc etiam saluti intelligi volens fidelium filios; ut hujus spei pignore matrimonijs quæ retinenda censuerat patrocinaretur. Alioquin meminerat dominicæ definitionis, nisi quis nascetur ex Aquâ et Spiritu, non ibit in regnum Dei, i. e. non erit sanctus. Ita omnis anima eousque in Adam censetur, donec in

Christo reconseatur; et tamdiu immunda, quamdiu reconseatur; peccatrix autem quia immunda."

'So there is almost no being born clean [*or free from sin*] that is of heathens; for hence the apostle says, 'That *of either parent sanctified, the children that are born are holy*, by reason of the prerogative of that seed, and also the instruction in their education. '*Else*, says he, *were they unclean*; — but yet meaning to be understood thus, that the children of the faithful are designed for holiness, and so for salvation; that, by a pledge of such hope, he might plead for those marriages which he would have to be continued. Otherwise [*or as for any other meaning*] he knew well enough what our Lord had determined, *Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God*; that is, *he shall not be holy*. Thus every soul is reckoned as in Adam, so long till it be anew enrolled in Christ; and so long unclean, till it be so enrolled and sinful, because unclean,' &c.

I have cited these passages at large and all together, that the reader may try if he can pick any coherent sense out of them. It is the property of warm men, when they are speaking earnestly on one subject, and urging that, to overlash, so as that when they are speaking on another with like earnestness, they fall into contradiction of what they said before. This author, in the places here first cited, treating of the *necessity* of baptism, speaks of that necessity as absolute; and of those that die unbaptized as lost men; and is enraged at those that maintain that faith without it is sufficient to salvation; yet afterward, when he is discoursing of the *weight*, as he calls it, of baptism, he advises several sorts of people to delay it; and to encourage them, tells them, that if they should by that delay happen to miss of it, "an entire faith is secure of salvation."

The most probable guess that I can make of that which was his steady meaning (if he had any) is, That those who put off their baptism negligently, or as slighting it, do, if they finally die without it, lose their life; but that in

those that put it off only that they may be fitter for it, and in a more likely condition to keep it unstained, if by that means they happen to die without it, the will and purpose of being baptized shall be accepted for the deed.

When he is discoursing on the aforesaid subject of the weight of baptism, he finds fault with the custom of baptizing *infants*, and would have them delayed till they are able to understand and consider what they do; and then, farther, till they are married; and if they do not marry, or if their consort die, then, farther, till the danger of lust is over, which is frequently not till old age. A strange advice, and which no man either of the antients, or moderns, either of the one or the other side in this controversy, do approve of; and to urge his opinion the more, he speaks of infants as if they were innocent or sinless, and so had no need of the forgiveness of sins granted in this sacrament.

In the last cited place, when he is on another theme, he plainly owns the Catholic doctrine of original sin in infants; and that every soul born of Adam is *unclean* and *sinful*, and continues so till it be enrolled or ranked anew in Christ; and cites, as pertinent to their case, the *Prescription*, as he calls it, or the standing rule (John iii. 5) *Except any one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into God's kingdom.*

How to reconcile this diversity I know not, unless his meaning (when he would have spoke for good) were, That the baptism of infants, and of those other sorts of persons, should be delayed till the times he speaks of, in case there were no danger of death in the meanwhile; but that in case of such danger it should be administered presently; in which case he says it is so necessary, that any one that is present (whether in orders or not, so he determines it) ought to administer it, or else he is guilty of the person's ruin or perdition.

I like this my resolution of his opinion the better, because I find it to be what several of each of the disagreeing parties do agree to have been his sense; for,

as * Mr. Baxter makes this acknowledgement: — "Yet again I will confess that the words of Tertullian and Nazianzen shew that it was long before all were agreed of the very time, or of the necessity of baptizing infants before any use of reason, in case they were like to live to maturity," — so † Mr. Danvers, his antagonist, owns this: — "Tertullian, that, as Dr. Barlow tells us, was so great an opposer of infant baptism, as irrational and unwarrantable, yet had this fancy of baptizing a dying child to save it." Some body or other had so strangely imposed upon this man, that he thought the modern Pædobaptists were ashamed to own this doctrine, That a child or other person is to be baptized that he may be saved." Also, ‡ Mr. Tombs says, "If he [Tertullian] did allow it, it was only in case of necessity, as may appear by his words in his book *de Anima*, c. 39;" — and to name one of the church of Rome, Vasquez says, That "those places in the book *de Anima*, and those where he makes baptism necessary to salvation, do not prove that he recanted his opinion; § for he might well enough assert that baptism is necessary for all, and yet think that it was not to be given before adult age in any other case but only that of extreme necessity."

This explication of his meaning is also confirmed from the older editions of this book *de Baptismo*; which, instead of those words in Rigaltius's edition, *Quid enim necesse, sponsores*, &c. ('What need is there that godfathers,' &c.) read thus, *Quid enim necesse est, si non tam necesse, sponsores*, &c. 'What occasion is there, except in case of necessity, that the godfathers,' &c. So it is in the edition of Pamelius; and so, as Pamelius affirms, Gaigneus, the first editor of this book *de Baptismo*, has it; but I have followed the edition which I had, which is Rigaltius's (only leaving a blank at the place) supposing he had some ground, from the manu-

* More Proofs, part 2, ch. 4, sect. 59.
† First Answer to Willis, p. 9.
‡ Examen of Marshall's Sermon, p. 10.
§ In tertiam partem Thomæ, tom. 2, Disp. 154, c. 1.

scripts, to leave out that clause; yet it cannot be denied that he has (as Mr. le Clerc * observes) set some passages false that were true in the former editions; nor that he has otherwise shewn himself partial for the Antipædobaptists, as I shall shew hereafter (Part 2, ch. 11); and, therefore, I incline now to the opinion, that the old editions are the truest; and that it ought to be read "except in case of necessity;" and then the case is plain how his meaning was.

But that which most deserves the reader's observation is, That the words of Tertullian do not import that the *custom* of the Christians at that time was to leave infants unbaptized; but, on the contrary, they plainly intimate that there was a custom of baptizing them, — only he dislikes that *that* custom should be generally used; for, when he says "Why does that innocent age make such haste?" &c. his words shew the matter of fact to have been so, together with his opinion against it; but the thing we now enquire of, is the practice of the church, and not one Doctor's opinion, especially when it does not appear that any body was prevailed on by him to alter that practice; for there is no appearance that either the Montanists (to whom he turned) or the Tertullianists (whom he set up) were against it. On the contrary, St. Austin †, reciting the opinions of both these sects, does not mention any such thing held by either of them; and says, at other places, that he never read of any sect that did deny it, as I shew hereafter.

The same observation ought to be made concerning the *sponsors*, or godfathers, whom he speaks of as used in the baptism of infants that could not answer for themselves; which shews the great mistake of some of the more ignorant persons among the Antipædobaptists, who derive the use of godfathers from I know not what *Pope* of Rome of late years; whereas this was within 100 years of the apostles.

---

* Quæstiones Hieronym. Q. 9, c. 3.
† Lib. de Hæresibus, c. 26 et 86.

It is a heedless answer that he makes to those words of our Saviour, *Suffer little children to come to me*, &c. when he says "Let them come when they are grown up, when they understand," &c.; — for that seems to be the very thing that the disciples said when they rebuked those that brought them; for which rebuke our Saviour blamed the disciples. It is a something better answer which the Antipædobaptists now-a-days give, viz. That our Saviour would indeed have infants brought to him then in their infancy, and before they understood, and that he blessed them, &c.; but we do not read that he baptized them. To which the other reply, That he declared the love of God to them, by his blessing and embracing, and saying, *Of such is the kingdom of God*; which shews them to be capable of the covenant of mercy; and that infants are expressly admitted to enter covenant (Deut. xxix. 10) *you, your little ones*, &c.; and, in the Old Testament, had the seal of the covenant. From whence it will follow, that it is no absurdity by reason of their nonage, which is the only thing Tertullian argues from; and besides, when our Saviour says, *Of such is the kingdom of God* (which shews them to be capable of his kingdom); and thereupon orders them to be brought to him, and says *Forbid* [or withhold] *them not*, since he is now present with us only in his ordinances and sacraments, what way have we to bring our children to him, as he orders, but by baptism, to offer and dedicate them to him?

In the same book of Baptism, c. 5, he observes, that the Heathen nations also used baptism as a religious rite, and particularly "in the mysteries of Apollo and Ceres, persons were baptized," *idque se in regenerationem et impunitatem perjuriorum suorum agere præsumunt*. 'And they say, they do this for their regeneration and the pardon of their former perjuries.' And he says, "Here we see the aim of the Devil, imitating the things of God. He means, the Heathens imitated the Jewish baptism. —

One thing more ought to be observed, out of the passage I cited from Tertullian's book *de Anima*, viz.

that he expounds that text (1 Cor. vii. 14) *Else were your children unclean, but now they are holy*, much after the same rate as many modern Pædobaptists do of *baptismal* holiness, — only he thinks the apostle speaks of it, not as then given, but as designed for them. He paraphrases *sancti*, holy, by *sanctitati designati*, designed for holiness, viz. when they come to be baptized, as his following words in the said passage shew, if the reader will turn back to them. This sense of a baptismal holiness the Antipædobaptists (who understand no more by it but that such children are not bastards) would condemn as a new exposition; but I shall shew, by more instances that will come in my way, and especially in chap. 19, where I compare together all the expositions of this text given by the antients, that it was the most general one.

It is plain that St. Austin and Pelagius, and several others that managed the Pelagian controversy, had never seen Tertullian's book of Baptism; for when St. Austin * pleaded that no Christian, Catholic, or sectary, had ever taught to the contrary; but that one reason for the baptizing of infants was for the forgiveness of original sin, — Pelagius granted † that there was none that denied that they were to be baptized; but when he, Celestius, and Julian do ransack antiquity for places to shew that they are baptized on other accounts, and not for forgiveness, how neatly would that saying of Tertullian have fitted them, "What need their innocent [*or sinless*] age make such haste for the forgiveness of sin?" — or else we must say, they would not quote it, because he contradicts himself in this point; — or else they would not use his authority, which was in no good repute, because he revolted to heresy, though Dr. Allix concludes this book to have been written before.

It was customary in those times, if any one made use of Tertullian's authority, in any controverted matter, to stop his mouth with that saying of St. Hierom, ‡ *Illum*

---

* See ch. 19. † See ch. 19.

‡ Adv. Helvidium.

hominem ecclesiæ non fuisse, that Tertullian was not a man of the church; and Pelagius had a great mind (if it had been possible for him continuing in his opinion of denying original sin) to have continued a member of the Catholic church.

Baronius likewise observes, that when the Donatists maintained against St. Austin and the Catholics, that baptism given by heretics is null, and the party must be baptized again, if St. Austin could have shewn that this opinion was first set on foot by Tertullian (whose name was in ill repute for his singular opinions) that *that* one thing would have served much to discredit it; and that he might have done, if he had ever seen this book of Baptism, where that opinion is asserted (c. 15) which is the earliest mention we find of it.

St. Hierom had seen this book, either in Greek or Latin (in both which languages it was written) for he quotes some passages out of it, about the story of St. Paul and Tecla; but nothing about the matter of infants.

CHAPTER V.

QUOTATIONS OUT OF ORIGEN.

[Year after the Apostles 110.]

Homilia 8, in Levit. c. 12.

AUDI David dicentem: In iniquitatibus, inquit, conceptus sum, et in peccatis peperit me mater mea, ostendens quod quæcunque anima in carne nascatur, iniquitatis et peccati sorde polluitur; et propterea dictum esse illud quod jam superius memoravimus, quia nemo mundus à sorde, nec si unius diei fuerit vita ejus. Addi his etiam illud potest, ut requiratur quid causæ sit, cum baptisma ecclesiæ in remissionem peccatorum detur, secundum ecclesiæ observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dari; cum utique si nihil esse in parvulis quod ad

remissionem deberet et indulgentiam pertinere, gratia baptismi superflua videretur.

'Hear David speaking: — *I was*, says he, *conceived* 'in iniquity, and in sin did my mother bring me forth;' shewing that every soul that is born in the flesh is pol- 'luted with the filth of sin and iniquity; and that, 'therefore, that was said which we mentioned before, 'that none is clean from pollution, though his life be 'but of the length of one day.

'Besides all this, let it be considered what is the 'reason that whereas the baptism of the church is 'given for forgiveness of sins, infants also are, by the 'usage of the church, baptized, when, if there were no- 'thing in infants that wanted forgiveness and mercy, 'the grace of baptism would be needless to them.'

Homil. in Lucam, 14.

"Quod frequenter inter fratres quæritur, loci occasione commota [l. commotus] retracto. Parvuli baptizantur in remissionem peccatorum. Quorum peccatorum? — vel quo tempore peccaverunt? Aut quomodo potest ulla lavacri in parvulis ratio subsistere, nisi juxta illum sensum de quo paulo ante diximus; nullus mundus à sorde, nec si unius diei quidem fuerit vita ejus super terram? Et quia per baptismi sacramentum nativitatis sordes deponuntur, propterea baptizantur et parvuli.

'Having occasion given in this place, I will mention 'a thing that causes frequent enquiries among the bre- 'thren. Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of 'sins. Of what sins? — or when have they sinned? — 'or how can any reason of the laver in their case hold 'good, but according to that sense that we mentioned 'even now? "None is free from pollution, though his 'life be but of the length of one day upon the earth;" 'and it is for that reason, because, by the sacrament of 'baptism, the pollution of our birth is taken away, that 'infants are baptized.'

Comment. in Epist. ad Romanos, lib. 5.

"Denique et in lege pro illo qui natus fuerit, jubetur offerri hostia, par turturum aut duo pulli columbini; ex quibus unus pro peccato, alius in holocautomata. Pro quo peccato offertur hic pullus unus? — nunquid nuper editus parvulus peccare potuit? Et tunc habet peccatum, pro quo hostia jubetur offerri, à quo mundus negatur quis esse, etsi unius diei fuerit vita ejus. De hoc ergo etiam David dixisse credendus est illud quod supra memoravimus, quia in peccato concepit me mater mea; secundum historiam enim nullum matris declaratur peccatum. Pro hoc et ecclesia ab apostolis traditionem suscepit etiam parvulis baptismum dare. Sciebant enim illi quibus mysteriorum secreta commissa sunt divinorum, quia essent in omnibus genuinæ sordes peccati, quæ per Aquam et Spiritum ablui deberent; propter quas etiam corpus ipsum, corpus peccati, nominatur."

'And also in the law it is commanded that a sacrifice 'be offered for every child that is born; a *pair* * *of* 'turtle doves, or two young pigeons; of which one is 'for a sin-offering, the other for a burnt-offering. 'For what sin is this one pigeon offered? Can the child 'that is new-born have committed any sin? It has even 'then sin, for which the sacrifice is commanded to be 'offered; from which even he *whose life is but of one* 'day is denied to be free. Of this sin David is to be 'supposed to have said that which we mentioned before, '*In sin did my mother conceive me;* for there is in the 'history no account of any particular sin that his mother had committed.

'For this also it was, that the church had *from the* 'apostles a tradition [or order] to give baptism even 'to infants; for they, to whom the divine mysteries were 'committed, knew that there is in all persons the natural 'pollution of sin, which must be done away by water

* Levit. xii. 8.

'and the Spirit; by reason of which the body itself is 'also called *the body of sin*.'

The plainness to these testimonies is such as needs nothing to be said of it, nor admits any thing to be said against it. They do not only suppose the practice to be generally known and used, but also mention its being ordered by the apostles.

But concerning the authenticity of them, there does need something to be said; for the Greek (which is the original) of all Origen's works being lost, except a very few, there remains only the Latin translations of them; and when these translations were collected together, a great many spurious ones were added and mixed with them, and went under Origen's name; but upon the renewal of learning, the critics quickly smelt them out, and admitted none for his, but such as appeared to have been done into Latin, either by St. Hierom [278] or else by Rufinus [298]; both of whom lived within the time limited for our present enquiry, viz. the first 400 years; for which reason I have rejected the quotations brought by some for infant baptism out of Origen on Job, which is plainly a spurious piece, written by some Arian.

Of these which I have brought, the Homilies on St. Luke were translated by St. Hierom; but those on Leviticus and the Comments on the Epist. to the Romans, by Rufinus. St. Hierom added a Preface to his translation, which is printed with it; a passage out of which is quoted by Rufinus,* and also some part of the translation itself; and St. Hierom himself mentions this work in the catalogue of his own † works; so that of this there is no doubt. Erasmus once doubted whether even these Homilies were the genuine works of Origen, as Huetius observes in these ‡ words:—"Erasmus, in his Epistle to Francis Ciglianus, had written that these Homilies did seem to be some other man's, and not

* Apolog. adv. Hieronym. secunda.
† De Scriptoribus Eccl. ‡ Origenianorum, lib. 3, p. 153.

Origen's; but in his *Censure*, affixed to the books of Origen, he recanted his opinion, and acknowledged the true author;" — which I the rather note, because Mr. Tombs * and Mr. Danvers † do quote Erasmus on Luke i. 3, saying thus: "For so he seems to think, whoever he was whose Commentaries are extant upon Luke, under the title of *Adamantius*" [or, Origen]. From whence they conclude that Erasmus took them not to be Origen's, or at least doubted of it; which is not fair, if they knew that Erasmus had recanted his doubt, as is to be seen in his edition of Origen's Works.

Neither does any one raise any question of the translation of the other two, on Leviticus and the Romans, but that it was done by Rufinus; but these two men used several methods in translating; for, whereas Origen's books contained in them several expressions not consistent with the faith in some points, St. Hierom ‡ changed nothing, but expressed every thing as it was in the original, as he owns himself; but Rufinus altered or left out any thing that he thought not orthodox; and in the Homilies on Leviticus, he himself says that he took a greater liberty than ordinary.

All the world since have approved the method of St. Hierom, and blamed that of Rufinus; for it is fit for a translator to give a true account of what his author says, be it good or bad; whereas now, in these translations of Rufinus, the reader "is uncertain (as Erasmus angrily says) whether he read Origen or Rufinus.

Some Antipædobaptists do for this reason reject the quotations here brought out of the Homilies on Leviticus and the Romans, — it being uncertain whether they are the words of the author, or the additions or interpolations of the translator. This plea must needs give some abatement to the authority of these two testimonies; yet it is the less in this matter, because,

1. That on St. Luke, translated by St. Hierom, contains the same thing in effect. It is as full an evidence

* Third Review. † First Reply to Mr. Willis, p. 37.
‡ Vide Erasmum in Censura operum Origenis.

of the then practice, only it does not mention the tradition from the apostles.

2. There is no kind of probability that Rufinus (whatever interpolations he might make in other matters) made any alteration in this; since this was none of the subjects on which Origen's opinion was questioned by the church in Rufinus's time. Those things in which he was singular, are largely canvassed both by St. Hierom and Rufinus themselves in their invectives and apologies one against another; and also by * Epiphanius, and † Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, who reckons 35 singular opinions that Origen held; and they are about the resurrection of the same body, the eternity of Hell torments, the pre-existence of souls, some expressions about the Trinity, &c.; but not one word about this matter; and there is no pretence that Rufinus had any other occasion to alter any thing, but only as being a great lover of Origen, whatever was in his Comments expressed in a doubtful or heterodox sense concerning any of the aforesaid points, he left it out, or else gave it a favourable turn in the translation, or in some explication that he added; — but what is this to the baptism of infants, concerning which it is not pretended that Origen's enemies challenged him as holding any singular opinion?

3. Rufinus (who confesses that, in the translation of the Comments on Leviticus, he had used more freedom) says only this of his management in the translation of the Comments on the Epistle to the Romans, that he had ‡ "shortened this work by one half." He speaks of no addition to that; and it is in *that* that there is mention of the tradition from the apostles.

Mr. Tombs § says, That "if one read these passages, and consider how they are brought in, and how plain the expressions are against the Pelagians, one shall conceive that they were put in after the Pelagian heresy was con-

* Epist. ad Joannem Hierosolymit.
† Epistolæ Paschales B. P. tom. 4.
‡ Præfat. in Epist. ad Romanos.
§ Examen. p. 7.

futed by Hierom and Austin, who often tells us that the fathers, afore that controversy arose, did not speak plainly against the Pelagians; and of all others Origen is most taxed as Pelagianizing."

If the passages did speak of, or relate to any contest about the doctrine of original sin, or any adversaries to it, or did set themselves to prove it as a thing controverted, this exception would have some weight; but they speak of it as a supposed and known thing from Scripture, and as of a thing denied by none, and in no other style than many sayings of other fathers do before Pelagius's time, some of which I cited * out of Irenæus; and the opinion in Origen Pelagianized, was not as Mr. Tombs would intimate, in denying that corrupt state in which all are born into this world (his asserting of that in many other places is notorious, and he built his opinion of pre-existence on it); but in affirming That it is possible for a man in this life to arrive at such a perfect conquest of the said corruption, that he may afterward live without sin; which was another of the false doctrines of Pelagius. This is plainly proved to have been the opinion of Origen from the few words of St. Hierom, in the *Prologue to his Dialogues against the Pelagians;* where, having recited the opinions of some former heretics that vaunted themselves to be without sin, he adds, *Illud autem Origenis proprium est*, &c.; "but Origen had this peculiar opinion, that it is impossible for a human soul to be without sin from its beginning to its death; and, on the other side, that it is possible, when a man turns himself to a good life, to arrive to such strength, that afterwards he shall not sin." It was on account of this tenet that St. Hierom calls Origen *the Pelagians' beloved;* which he does at the latter end of the last of the dialogues above mentioned. Mr. Tombs might easily have observed, in those few works of Origen that are left in the original, as *plain expressions against the Pelagians* (as he calls it, *i. e.* as plain mentions of original sin) as there are in these passages. As in his 7th book against Celsus, p. 365

* Chap. 3.

(ed. Cant. 1658) he discourses much as he does here, how the books of the Old Testament do order a sin-offering to be offered καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄρτι γεγενημένων, οὐς ὁ καθαρὸν ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας. 'Even for infants new-born, as being not 'clear from sin;' — where he proceeds, on the same argument, to quote, as he does here, the saying of David (Psal. li. 5) and several such texts.

This argument of Mr. Tombs may be well retorted against those that think these passages were put in by Rufinus (Mr. Tombs, in one part of his discourse, seems to lay it on him; and yet in another, seems to think they were put in by some body afterward, or else he speaks absurdly when he makes it to be done after the Pelagian times); for whoever had put in any thing of original sin, Rufinus would not: he had been more likely to raze it out, if he had not been afraid of censure; for though he seems to have concealed his opinion from the world, except some few confidents, it was proved after his death, that he was an enemy to the doctrine of original sin, at least as derived from our first parents. St. Hierom does once or * twice reckon him by the name of Grunnius among the precursors, or those that had given occasion to Pelagius. He himself tells how some had accused him to Anastasius, Bishop of Rome, as having unsound opinions about the origin of the soul; and he makes but a lame answer to it, in the letter which he writes to him for his apology; but Celestius discovered all, when, being upon his trial at a council of Carthage (in which he was condemned for this heresy) there were three examinations and answers which St. Austin has quoted † out of the Acts of that Council, which was held *Anno Dom.* 412.

The Bishop Aurelius said, "Let the rest [*of the articles charged on him*] be read."

And there was read, *That the sin of Adam hurt himself only, and not mankind.*

* Ep. ad Ctesiphontem item. Præfat. lib. 4, in Jeremiam.
† Lib. de Peccato Originali, c. 3, 4.

Celestius answered, 'I said, that I was unresolved concerning the derivation of sin (yet so as to submit to any one to whom God has given the grace of knowledge); because I have heard different opinions of this from those that have been Presbyters of the Catholic church.'

Paulinus, the deacon, said, "Tell us their names."

Celestius said, 'The holy Presbyter Rufinus, who dwelt at Rome with holy Pammachius, I have heard him say That there is no derivation of sin.'

Paulinus, the deacon, said, "Are there any more?"

Celestius said, 'I have heard others also say the same.'

Paulinus, the deacon, said, "Tell us their names."

Celestius said, 'Is not one Presbyter enough for you?'

And afterward, in another place [*of the Acts*],

Aurelius, the bishop, said, "Let the rest of the charge be read."

And there was read, *That infants, when they are born, are in the same state that Adam was in before his transgression.*

Aurelius, the bishop, said, "Did you ever teach so, Celestius, *That infants?*" &c.

Celestius said, 'Let him explain how he means, *before his transgression*,' &c.

Aurelius, the bishop, said, "Whether the state of infants now to be baptized, be such as Adam's was before his transgression,—or whether they do derive the guilt of transgression from the same sinful origin from whence they are born? This is what the deacon, Paulinus, would hear from you."

Paulinus, the deacon, said, "Whether he has taught that or not? Let him deny."

Celestius said, 'I told you before concerning the derivation of sin, That I have heard several in the Catholic church deny it; and some I have heard affirm it. It is a matter of question [*or controversy*] not of heresy. As for infants, I always said, that they stand in need of baptism; and that they ought to be baptized,' &c.

We see that though Celestius pretended he could have named others, yet he named none but Rufinus, who was dead, as holding this tenet. Rufinus, therefore, was not likely to insert any thing into Origen's works about original sin.

I know that Garner, the Jesuit, would have it, that the Rufinus, intended by Celestius, was another of the same name; and not he whose works we have; and that, because Mercator calls him a *Syrian*, — whereas this Rufinus, whose works we have, was of Aquileia; but others, with more reason, think that Mercator calls him a Syrian, only because he lived 30 years in Syria, and those eastern parts, and brought his errors and his love of Origen from thence; and the Rufinus meant by Celestius has always been taken for the same that is ordinarily known by that name.

There would have been the less need of this long disquisition to prove that the forecited passages of Origen are genuine, if that passage of his which Sir Peter (afterwards Lord Chief Justice) King has found out in the original Greek of his Commentaries on St. Matthew, and produces * to this purpose as an evidence for infant baptism, were not a very ambiguous one. If the sentence had ended there, where Sir Peter cuts it off, it had been a plain case that Origen must have been understood to speak there of infants in age; but some words which he has left out, do, when they are read with the rest, very much puzzle the cause, and make it doubtful whether Origen be to be there understood of infants in age, or of such Christian men as are endued with the innocence and simplicity of infants. The impartial management which I have promised, obliges me to set down the whole place, or else none of it.

Origen is there commenting on those words of our Saviour (Mat. xviii. 10) *Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in*

* Inquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, &c. of the Primitive Church, page 57.

Heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in Heaven. He has a long discourse, and something rambling; speaking sometimes of infants in age (such as our Saviour had one then before him, mentioned in verse 2) and sometimes of men resembling infants. After which he puts this question,

Comment. in Mat. tom. 13, *pag.* 331, *ed. Huetij. Rhotomag.* 1668.

Εἶτα πάλιν ζητήσειεν ἄν τις, πότε τῶν δεικνυμένων ὑπὸ τȣ̃ Σωτῆρος μικρῶν οἱ λεγόμενοι αὐτῶν Ἄγγελοι προίστανται; πότερον δεξάμενοι τὴν οἰκονομίαν περὶ αὐτȣ̃ς διοικεῖν ἀφ' ȣ̃ διὰ λȣτρȣ̃ παλιγγενεσίας, ᾧ ἐγενήθησαν, ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν καὶ ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθȣ̃σι καὶ μηκέτι ὑποκείμενοι πονηρᾷ τίνι δυνάμει; ἢ ἀπὸ γενέσεως, κατὰ τὴν τȣ̃ Θεȣ̃ προγνωσιν καὶ τὸν προορισμὸν αὐτȣ̃, &c.

'Then again one may enquire, When it is that the 'angels here spoken of are set over those little ones 'shewed [*or signified*] by our Saviour? Whether they 'take the care and management of them from the time 'when they, by the washing of regeneration, whereby 'they were new-born, do, *as new-born babes desire the 'sincere milk of the word*, and are no longer subject to 'any evil power? — or, from their birth, according to 'the fore-knowledge of God and his predestinating of 'them,' &c.

If Origen meant to say, That it is a question whether such a little child as our Saviour then set before the apostles, have his guardian angel given him by God from his birth, or from his baptism, then it is a plain supposition that such infants were baptized; but his mention of their desiring of the milk of the word at the time of their baptism, makes it doubtful whether he meant of such who are infants in a proper sense, or whether he had in mind, at that place, such men as he had before called *Christ's little ones, i. e.* men who, when converted and baptized, do become humble in spirit, &c.; and this doubt is increased by observing the answer that he gives to

this his own question; for he says, That for one side of it (viz. that the guardian angel is given to every one from his birth) these places of Scripture do make:—*God who separated me from my mother's womb* (Gal. i. 15.) and *Before thou camest forth out of the womb, I sanctified thee*, &c. (Jer. i. 5.) But for the other side (viz. that it is at baptism that the good angel is given) this does make, that "the time of people's unbelief is under the angels of Satan: and then after their new birth, he that has bought us with his own blood delivers them to a good angel." He has also another fancy, that possibly the evil angel that presides over a man during his heathenism, is at the man's conversion converted also himself, and becomes a good angel to him.

Moreover, in the text itself, though our Saviour had begun his discourse with taking a little child, and telling them they must humble themselves as that little child; yet in the process of it (and before he came to speak the forecited words) viz. at v. 6, he uses the phrase of "Little ones which believe in him."

Upon the whole, the proof of infant baptism, from this place of Origen, does labour under considerable ambiguity; and it is better for the Pædobaptists not so to rely upon it for a proof of Origen's sense, but that they do adhere likewise to those passages of his which I recited before; which, though they are but translations of such books of his, the original whereof is not now extant; yet they are, as I have shewn, translations well attested.

I will add to this one passage more, in which Origen brings in this text of Scripture, which is,

Hom. 9. *in Josuam.* — He is speaking of that text, Jos. viii. 33; how Joshua wrote a copy of the law of Moses on the stones of the altar; and that he did it in the presence of the children of Israel. And in allusion to this, speaking of our Saviour's writing his law, not on stones, but in the hearts of his disciples, he finds this way to prove that this also is done in the presence of the children of Israel. He says that the word *Israel* signifies a mind that sees God; and that *that* definition

fits well to angels: and that the angels are to be thought to be present at the giving of the holy sacraments. And then he adds, —

"Secundum Domini sententiam dicentis de infantibus (quod et tu fuisti infans in baptismo) quia angeli eorum semper vident faciem patris mei qui in cœlis est, coram illis igitur filiis Israel qui aderant illo tempore cum tibi fidei sacramenta traderentur, videntibus faciem Dei, Jesus in corde tuo Deuteronomium scripsit."

'According to that saying of our Lord concerning 'infants (and thou wast an infant when thou wast baptized) Their angels do always behold the face of my 'Father which is in Heaven. So then Jesus wrote his 'law in thy heart in the presence of those children of 'Israel, Beholders of God's face at the time when the 'sacrament of faith was given thee.'

All that is doubtful in this place too, is, whether when he says, Thou wast an infant when thou wast baptized, he meant an infant in age, or only an infant in the aforesaid spiritual sense. Erasmus takes it in the former sense; for in his edition of Origen's works, he or else Grynæus the editor, sets in the margin of that place the word *Pædobaptismus*.

Though this part of Origen's works be not extant in Greek, yet we may the more depend upon it, because Rufinus assures us that in the translation of these Homilies, and those on Judges, he has neither added nor omitted any thing, but truly rendered what he found in the Greek books *Peroràt. in Hom. ad Romanos.*

But whatever be determined concerning the sense, or concerning the authenticity of this, or of any other one particular saying of Origen, that he in his books did generally speak of baptism as given to infants, is plain by this: that St. Hierom (who was of all the Latin fathers the greatest reader of Origen's works in their original language) does acquaint us both that he did so; and also that he built his false hypothesis of the pre-existence of souls on this ground partly; that by it he might

give the better account of the sins for which an infant is baptized: for St. Hierom, in his third dialogue against the Pelagians, having upbraided them that they could not apprehend what the Scripture teaches of original sin in infants, as derived from Adam, for the forgiveness whereof they should be baptized, says to them in the last words of that book, —

"Quod si injusta vobis videtur alienorum remissio peccatorum; qua non indiget qui peccare non potuit: transite ad amasium vestrum, qui præterita in cœlus et antiqua delicta solva dicit in baptismo. Ut cujus in cæteris auctoritate ducimini, et in hac parte errorem sequamini."

'And if the forgiveness of sins, which are the sins of another, do seem to you unjust, or such as he [*an infant*] that could commit no sin himself has no need of, then march over to your beloved [*plainly meaning Origen*] who holds, that in baptism are forgiven those sins which have been committed in a former state in the celestial regions; and as you are influenced by his authority in your other points, partake of his error in this too.' The place, with the context, I must recite hereafter, c. 19.

Now Origen, or any other antient, mentioning a practice as received, and giving a false ground for it, is as good a witness of the practice itself as the most orthodox mentioner of it.

If there were found in these translations of Origen but one or two places, and those in Rufinus alone that did speak of infant baptism, there might have been suspicion of their being interpolations: but when there are so many of them brought in on several occasions, in translations made by several men, who were of several parties, and enemies to one another (as St. Hierom and Rufinus were) and upon no tentation (for it is certain that in their time there was no dispute about infant baptism) that they should be all without any reason forged is absurd to think: especially if we consider that

these translators lived not much more than 100 years after Origen's time; and the Christians then must know whether infants had been used to be baptized in Origen's time or not: the very tradition from father to son must have carried a memory of it for so short a time: and then for them to make Origen speak of a thing which all the world knew was not in use in his time, must have made them ridiculous. Besides, in the Greek remains there are sentences and expressions so alike and parallel to those which I have here brought translations of, and citations of texts of Scripture applied so much to the same purpose, that they do not confirm these to be genuine translations. I will recite one of them (which I have observed since the last edition) which, though it has not in so express words as the other the particular mention of giving baptism to infants, yet the reader will see that it supposes it to be necessary for them. It is in his *Comment. in Matth. tom.* 15. *p.* 391. *Ed. præd.* He is there commenting on that answer of our Saviour to St. Peter's question (Matt. xix. 28) *Ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, shall sit upon twelve thrones*, &c. He says, That by the regeneration in this place, is meant the time of the resurrection of the dead. Ταύτην λήχονται τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν· Αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ παλιγγενεσία, καινή τις γένεσις οὖσα, ὅτε οὐρανὸς καινὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καινή, &c. 'This 'power they are to receive at the resurrection of the 'dead: for that is a regeneration, being a new gene-'ration [*or birth*] when a new Heaven and a new 'Earth are made,' &c. And he adds, Ἐκείνης δὲ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας προοίμιόν ἐστι, τὸ καλούμενον παρά τῷ Παύλῳ λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας, &c. 'And the way [*or prepara-'tive, or pre-requisite*] to that regeneration [*in the 'world to come*] is that by which St. Paul is called the 'laver [*or washing*] of regeneration,' &c. Then follow these words:—

Τάχα δὲ καὶ κατὰ μετὰ τὸν γένεσιν οὐδείς ἐστι καθαρὸς ἀπὸ μύπου, οὐδ' εἰ μία ἡμέρα εἴη ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὸ περὶ τῆς γενέσεως

μυστήριον, ἐφ' ᾗ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Δαβὶδ ἐν Πεντεκοστῷ Ψάλμῳ λελεγμένον, ἕκαστος πάντων εἰς γένεσιν ἐληλυθότων λέγοι, ἔχον οὕτως· Ὅτι ἐν ἀνομίαις συνελήφθην, καὶ ἐν ἁμαρτίαις ἐκίσσησέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου.

Κατὰ δὲ τὸν λουτρῶν παλιγγενεσίαν πᾶς μετὰ καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ῥύπου ὁ γενηθεὶς ἄνοθεν, ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ Πνεύματος· ἵνα τολμήσας εἴπω, καθαρὸς δι' ἐσόπτρου καὶ ἐν αἰνίγματι. Κατὰ δὲ τὸν ἄλλην παλιγγενεσίαν, ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, πᾶς ὁ εἰς τὸν ἐν Χριστῷ παλιγγενεσίαν ἐκείνην φθάσας καθαρώτατός ἐστιν ἀπὸ ῥύπου· πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον, καὶ αὐτὸς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας φθάνων ἐπ' ἐκείνην τὸν παλιγγενεσίαν.

'There is, perhaps, in our generation [*or first birth*] 'none clean from pollution, though his life be but of 'one day; because of the mystery of our generation '[*or birth*] in respect of which, every one of all that are 'born may say that which was said by David in the '50th Psalm, which was this:—*I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.*

'But in the regeneration [*or new birth*] by the laver '[*or baptism*] every one that is born again of water and 'the Spirit, is clean from pollution; clean (as I may 'venture to say) as by a glass darkly.

'And in that other regeneration, when the Son of 'Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, every one 'that attains to that regeneration in Christ is clean 'from pollution in the highest degree,—*face to face.* 'And it is by the washing of regeneration that he comes 'to that other regeneration.'

If any reader compare this passage, or the other which I cited before out of the book *contra Celsum*, with those quotations of St. Hierom's and Rufinus's translation, the likeness of the notions, of the style, of the chain of thought, and the method of arguing in each, will incline him to take them all to be of the same author, beside the proofs I gave before.

I think it is not less than 40 times that Origen in his remaining Greek works does cite that text of Job xiv. which in the Septuagint translation is as he recites it:—

None is free from pollution, though his life be but of one day. Which is also cited there in both the translations of Hierom and Rufinus, and in many other places of their translations.

And as it is said in the translations, "This natural pollution of sin must be done away by water and the Spirit," so it is said to the same purpose here, That that pollution which infects every one from his first generation, so as that an infant, one day old, is not free from it, is cleansed in a good degree by the regeneration of baptism in this world; and perfectly at that great regeneration or restitution of all things which shall be in the world to come.

And (what I would chiefly remark) that this washing of regeneration [the baptismal regeneration in this world] is the προοίμιον, the beginning, or way to, or preparative, or pre-requisite, of that in the other world; and that it is by this that any one φθάνει does come to or arrive at that.

There are in all writers, and in all books, some sayings or rules in which, though they are expressed in general and comprehensive terms, yet infants are not meant to be included. But that cannot be supposed here, because he mentions their case particularly; and the discourse begins with speaking of their state from their birth, and from the time that they are but one day old. And when he says, that for all that are born the προοίμιον whereby they may come at the future great regeneration, is baptim in this life, though he does not here, as in the other places, express that their baptism must be in infancy, yet the nature of his argument supposes it; for if it be necessary for all who do pass from the original polluted state to that state of perfect purity, that they have this intermediate cleansing, Origen knew that nigh half of the persons born into the world must have it in infancy if at all, because they never come to adult age.

This notion of three several births, or generations, to every Christian, is common among ecclesiastical writers. I shall have occasion to cite a passage of Gregory Na-

zianzen speaking in the same manner. The first, his natural birth, the entrance into a polluted state; the second, his baptism, a new birth, or entrance into a cleansed state, a state of salvation; the third, his resurrection, his last and great new birth, an entrance into a glorified state. They call the third, as well as the second, a *regeneration*; and it is so in the highest sense of the word: therefore when I say that when they use the word, they always mean or denote baptism, I hope every reader perceives my meaning to be, that when they use that word in relation to the spiritual concerns of any person in this life, they do always refer to his baptism; for I own that the regeneration that is to be in the other life is quite another thing.

There is one circumstance that makes Origen a more competent witness to give evidence whether the baptizing of infants had been in use time out of mind or not, than most other authors that we have left to us of that age, because he was himself of a family that had been Christian for a long time. Tertullian and all the rest that we have mentioned, except Irenæus, must have been themselves baptized in adult age; because they were of heathen parents, and were the first of their family that turned Christians: but Origen's father was a martyr for Christ in the persecution under Severus, the year after the apostles 102. And Eusebius * assures us that his forefathers had been Christians for several generations: τῷ τὲ γὰρ Ὠριγένει τά τῆς κατά Χριστὸν διδασκαλίας ἐκ προγόνων ἐσώζετω. 'The Christian doc-' trine was conveyed to him from his forefathers.' Or, as Rufinus † translates it, *ab avis atque at avis*, 'From ' his grandfathers and great-grandfathers.'

That which gave occasion to Eusebius to inquire into his pedigree, was the slander of Porphyrius; for he, endeavouring to shew that the Christian religion had nothing in it of learning or science, and had none but illiterate followers, and not being able to deny or conceal the great repute of Origen for his skill in human

* Eccl. Hist. lib. 6. c. 19. † Lib. 6. c. 14.

literature, had feigned that he was at first a Heathen, and having learned their philosophy, and then turning Christian, had endeavoured to transfer and apply it to *trim up the Christian fables.* In confutation of this lie, Eusebius, as I said, sets forth his Christian Descent.

Now, since Origen was born *anno* 185, that is, the year after the apostles 85 (for he was 17 years old when his father suffered) his grandfather, or at least his great-grandfather, must have lived in the apostles time; and as he could not be ignorant whether he was himself baptized in infancy, so he had no farther than his own family to go for inquiry how it was practised in the times of the apostles.

Besides that he was, as I said, a very learned man, and could not be ignorant of the use of the churches, in most of which he had also travelled; for as he was born and bred at Alexandria, so it appears out of Eusebius *, that he had lived in Greece, and at Rome, and in Cappadocia, and Arabia, and spent the main part of his life in Syria and Palestine.

CHAPTER VI.

QUOTATIONS OUT OF ST. CYPRIAN.

[Year after the Apostles 150.]

Cypriani Epist. 64 (*Pamelij Edit.* 59) *ad Fidum.*

St. Cyprian was Bishop of Carthage; and it was the custom in that, as in all other great and metropolitical cities, for the neighbouring bishops to meet there at certain times, to consult of and determine any emergent affairs of the church.

At this time, *Anno Dom.* 253 [153], there were 66 of them in council; and one Fidus, a country bishop,

* Eccl. Hist. lib. 6.

had sent a letter with two cases, in which he desired their resolution; which they give in this epistle to him.

One being about one Victor, a Presbyter, that, after a crime committed, had, by the rashness of a certain bishop, been admitted too soon to absolution, is nothing to our concern.

The other question being, Whether an infant, before it was eight days old, might be baptized, if need required? I shall recite so much of the letter as concerns that.

" *Cyprianus et cæteri Collegæ, qui in Concilio affuerunt, numero 66, Fido Fratri, salutem.*

" Legimus literas tuas, frater carissime, quibus significasti de Victore quodam presbytero, &c. Quantum vero ad causam infantium pertinet, quos dixisti intra secundum vel tertium diem, quo nati sunt, constitutos baptizari non oportere; et considerandam esse legem circumcisionis antiquæ, ut intra octavum diem, eum qui natus est baptizandum et sanctificandum non putares, longe aliud in concilio nostro omnibus visum est. In hoc enim quod tu putabas esse faciendum nemo consensit; sed universi potius judicavimus nulli hominum nato misericordiam Dei et gratiam denegandam. Nam cum Dominus in evangelio suo dicat; filius hominis non venit animas hominum perdere, sed salvare; quantum in nobis est, si fieri potest, nulla anima perdenda est. Quid enim ei deest, qui semel in utero Dei manibus formatus est? Nobis enim atque oculis nostris secundum dierum secularium cursum accipere qui nati sunt, incrementum videntur. Ceterum quæcunque à Deo fiunt, Dei factoris majestate et opere perfecta sunt. Esse denique apud omnes sive infantes sive majores natu, unam divini muneris æqualitatem declarat nobis divinæ Scripturæ fides. Helizæus super infantem Sunamitidis viduæ filium qui mortuus jacebat, ita se Deum deprecans superstravit, ut capiti caput et faciei facies applicaretur, et superfusi Helizæi membra singulis parvuli membris, et pedes pedibus jungerentur. Quæ res si secundum nativitatis nostræ et corporis qualitatem cogitetur, adulto et provecto infans non posset æquari, nec cohæ-

rere et sufficere possent membra parva majoribus. Sed illic æqualitas divina et spiritualis exprimitur, quod pares atque æquales sint homines quando a Deo semel facti sunt, et possit ætas nostra in incrementis corporum secundum seculum, non secundum Deum habere discrimen. Nisi si et gratia ipsa quæ baptizatis datur, pro ætate accipientium vel minor vel major tribuitur, cum spiritus sanctus non de mensurâ, sed de pietate atque indulgentiâ paternâ æqualis omnibus præbeatur. Nam Deus ut personam non accipit, sic nec ætatem; cum se omnibus ad cœlestis gratiæ consecutionem æqualitate liberatâ præbet patrem. Nam et quod vestigium infantis in primis partus sui diebus constituti mundum non esse dixisti, quod unusquisque nostrum horreat ex osculari; nec hoc putamus ad cœlestem gratiam dandam impedimento esse oportere. Scriptum est enim, omnia munda sunt mundis; nec aliquis nostrum id debet horrere, quod Deus dignatus est facere. Nam etsi adhuc infans a parta novus est, non ita est tamen, ut quisquam illum in gratiâ dandâ atque in pace facienda horrere debeat osculari; quando in osculo infantis unusquisque nostrum pro suâ religione ipsas adhuc recentes Dei manus debeat cogitare; quas in homine modo formato et recens nato quodammodo ex osculamur, quando id quod Deus facit amplectimur. Nam quod in Judaica circumcisione carnali octavus dies observabatur, sacramentum est in umbra atque imagine ante præmissum, sed veniente Christo veritate completum; nam quia octavus dies, i. e. post Sabbatum primus, dies futurus erat, quo Dominus resurgeret, et nos vivificaret, et circumcisionem nobis spiritualem daret; hic dies octavus, i. e. post Sabbatum primus et Dominicus præcessit in imagine, quæ imago cessavit superveniente postmodum veritate, et data nobis spirituali circumcisione. Propter quod neminem putamus a gratia consequenda impediendum esse ea lege quæ jam statuta est, nec spiritualem circumcisionem impediri carnali circumcisione debere; sed omnem omnino admittendum esse ad gratiam Christi; quando et Petrus in Actis Apostolorum loquatur et dicat; Dominus mihi dixit neminem hominum

communem dicendum et immundum. Ceterum si homines impedire aliquid ad gratiæ consecutionem posset; magis adultos et provectos et majores natu possent impedire peccata graviora. Porro autem si etiam gravissimis delictoribus, et in Deum multum ante peccantibus, cum postea crediderint, remissa peccatorum datur, et a baptismo atque a gratia nemo prohibetur; quanto magis prohiberi non debet infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quod secundum Adam carnaliter natus contagium mortis antiquæ prima nativitate contraxit? — qui ad remissam peccatorum accipiendam hoc ipso facilius accedit, quod illi remittuntur non propria sed aliena peccata. Et idcirco, frater carissime, hæc fuit in concilio nostra sententia, a baptismo atque a gratia Dei, qui omnibus et misericors et benignus et pius est, neminem per nos debere prohiberi. Quod cum circa universos observandum sit atque retinendum; magis circa infantes ipsos et recens natos observandum putamus, qui hoc ipso de ope nostra ac de Divina misericordia plus merentur, quod in primo statim nativitatis suæ ortu plorantes ac flentes, nihil aliud faciunt quam deprecantur.

Optamus te, frater carissimè, semper benè valere."

'*Cyprian and the rest of the Bishops who were present* '*at the Council*, 66 *in number, to Fidus, our Bro-* '*ther, greeting.*

'We read your letter, most dear brother, in which 'you write of one Victor, a priest, &c.; but as to the 'case of infants: Whereas you judge "that they must 'not be baptized within two or three days after they 'are born; and that the rule of circumcision is to be 'observed, so that none should be baptized and sanc- 'tified before the eighth day after he is born," we were 'all in our assembly of the contrary opinion; for as for 'what you thought fitting to be done, there was not one 'that was of your mind; but all of us, on the contrary, 'judged that the grace and mercy of God is to be de- 'nied to no person that is born; for whereas our Lord, 'in his Gospel, says *The Son of Man came not to de-*

'*stroy mens' souls* [or lives]; *but to save them.* As 'far as lies in us, no soul, if possible, is to be lost.

'For what is there deficient in him who has been once 'formed in the womb by the hands of God? They ap- 'pear to us and in our eyes to attain perfection [or en- 'crease] in the course of the days of the world; but all 'things that are made by God are perfect, by the work 'and power of God their Maker. The Scripture gives us 'to understand the equality of the divine gift on all, whe- 'ther infants or grown persons. Elisha, in his prayer 'to God, stretched himself on the infant son of the 'Shunamite woman that lay dead, in such manner that 'his head, and face, and limbs, and feet were applied to 'the head, face, limbs, and feet of the child; which, if 'it be understood according to the quality of our body 'and nature, the infant could not hold measure with the 'grown man, nor its little limbs fit and reach to his 'great ones; but in that place a spiritual equality, and 'such as is in the esteem of God, is intimated to us, by 'which persons that are once made by God are alike 'and equal; and our growth of body by age makes a 'difference in the sense of the world, but not of God,— 'unless you will think that the grace itself which is given 'to baptized persons, is greater or less, according to the 'age of those that receive it; whereas the Holy Spirit 'is given not by different measures, but with a fatherly 'affection and kindness equal to all; for God, as he ac- 'cepts no one's person, so not his age; but with an 'exact equality shews himself a Father to all, for their 'obtaining the heavenly grace.

'And whereas you say, That "an infant, in the first 'days after its birth, is unclean, so that any of us abhors 'to kiss it." We think not this neither to be any rea- 'son to hinder the giving to it the heavenly grace; for 'it is written, *To the clean all things are clean*; nor 'ought any of us to abhor that which God has vouch- 'safed to make. Though an infant come fresh from the 'womb, no one ought to abhor to kiss it at the giving of 'the grace and the owning of the peace [or brotherhood] 'when, as in kissing the infant, every one of us ought,

'out of devotion, to think of the fresh handy-work of 'God; for we do in some sense kiss his hands in the 'person newly-formed and but new-born, when we em-'brace that which is of his making.

'That the eighth day was observed in the Jewish cir-'cumcision, was a type going before in a shadow and re-'semblance; but on Christ's coming was fulfilled in the 'substance;—for, because the eighth day, that is, the 'next to the Sabbath-day, was to be the day on which 'the Lord was to rise from the dead and quicken us, 'and give us the spiritual circumcision,—this eighth 'day, that is, the next day to the Sabbath, or Lord's 'Day, was signified in the type before; which type 'ceased when the substance came and the spiritual cir-'cumcision was given to us.

'So that we judge that no person is to be hindered 'from obtaining the grace, by the law that is now ap-'pointed; and that the spiritual circumcision ought not 'to be restrained by the circumcision that was according 'to the flesh; but that all are to be admitted to the 'grace of Christ, since Peter, speaking in the Acts of the 'Apostles, says *The Lord has shewn me that no person 'is to be called common or unclean.*

'If any thing could be an obstacle to persons against 'their obtaining the grace, the adult, and grown, and 'elder men, would be rather hindered by their more 'grievous sins. If then the greatest offenders, and they 'that have grievously sinned against God before, have, 'when they afterward come to believe, forgiveness of 'their sins, and no person is kept off from baptism and 'the grace,—how much less reason is there to refuse 'an infant who being newly-born, has no sin, save that 'being descended from Adam according to the flesh, 'he has from his very birth contracted the contagion of 'the death anciently threatened!—who comes for this 'reason more easily to receive forgiveness of sins, be-'cause they are not his own, but others sins that are for-'given him.

'This, therefore, dear brother, was our opinion in the 'assembly, That it is not for us to hinder any person

'from baptism and the grace of God, who is merciful, 'and kind, and affectionate to all; — which rule, as it 'holds for all, so we think it more especially to be observed in reference to infants and persons newly-born; 'to whom our help and the divine mercy is rather to be 'granted; because, by their weeping and wailing at 'their first entrance into the world, they do intimate 'nothing so much as that they implore compassion.

'Dear Brother, we wish you always good health.'

It is not denied by any but that this is a plain proof of infants baptism being taken for granted at that time; since both Fidus, who puts the question, and the Council that resolve it, do shew, by their words, their sense to be that they are to be baptized in infancy, — only Fidus thought, not before the eighth day.

Mr. Tombs, who makes some exceptions against the foregoing testimonies, as not being plain declarations of the author's mind, or not certainly genuine (but yet no other exceptions than what I have mentioned) grants this to be plain, and to * "say enough, and more than enough, except it had spoke more to the purpose, and would have it pass for the spring-head of Infant Baptism."

But there is one Antipædobaptist writer, a man of more boldness in his assertions than the rest, that would represent this as a forged or supposititious piece. † "We would rather believe (says he) that these things were foisted into his writings by that villanous cursed generation, that so horribly abused the writings of most of the antients:" — but as Mr. Tombs was more wary and learned than to object to any such thing, so there could not have been any thing more unluckily pleaded; for so it happens, that in all antiquity there is not any one piece that can more certainly be proved to be genuine than this, because it is so often quoted by St. Hierom and St. Austin, that lived a while after;

* Examen, p. 10, 11.
† Danvers's Treatise of Baptism, part 2, ch. 3.

not in question of infant baptism, but of original sin, which the Pelagians denied, though they, as I shall shew hereafter, granted and practised infant baptism. I shall have occasion in the following chapters to cite some of the passages of the foresaid fathers, where they mention this epistle of St. Cyprian, and at present shall refer the reader to such places of St. Austin, where he transcribes large passages *verbatim* out of it, so as to recite it by parcels almost all.

In his (ep. 28) *ad Hieronym.* he, speaking of some that taught that the body only, and not the soul, must suffer for original sin, says, among other things, this: — "Blessed Cyprian, not making any new decree, but expressing the firm faith of the church, in refuting those that thought a child must not be baptized before the eighth day; said (not that no *flesh*, but) that no *soul* must be lost."

And (lib. 4, *contra duas epist. Pelagianorum*, c. 8) he recites three large passages out of it.

Lib 3, *de peccatorum meritis et remissione*, c. 5, having mentioned this epistle, he tells Marcellinus, the nobleman to whom he writes, "You may, if you please, read the epistle itself of the said martyr, about the baptizing of infants; for there is no doubt but it is to be had at Carthage. However, I have thought fit to transcribe some part of it, as much as is necessary for our present question" [which was about original sin] — so he begins where I began: — "But as to the case of infants: whereas you judge they must not be baptized within two or three days," &c.; and goes on to repeat two large paragraphs *verbatim* out of it.

Also having occasion to * preach at Carthage against Pelagianism, he, towards the end of his sermon, recites to the people some part of this epistle; telling them That "they are the words of Cyprian, an ancient bishop of that see. Holy Cyprian (says he) was asked Whether an infant might be baptized before the eighth day? — because, in the old law, it was not lawful to

* Serm. 14, de Verbis Apost.

circumcise but on the eighth day. The question was of the day of baptizing, for of original sin there was no question; and, therefore, from a thing of which there was no question, the question that was started was resolved. St. Cyprian said, among other things," — so that we judge that no person is to be hindered from obtaining the grace, &c. [proceeding to those words]; because they are not his own, but others sins that are forgiven him. "See how he, making no doubt of this matter [viz. *of original sin*] solves that of which there was doubt: he took this from the foundation of the church, to fasten a stone that was loose." — St. Hierom also quotes a good part of it *verbatim, lib.* 3, *Dialog. adv. Pelag.*

Since then it is plain, that it was at that time, and in those places where St. Cyprian had lived, commonly known for his, and frequent in the hands of learned men, there is the less need of considering those objections which are brought as probable against its being genuine.

The aforesaid author says, "We meet with no such council, neither can it appear where it was held."

This is to make himself more ignorant than he is, as if he did not know that the date of this is before those times in which the Acts of the Councils used to be registered and collected into volumes; so that this had been lost, if it had not been preserved among the epistles of this father; and besides, that they never used to put into the volumes of councils the acts of those ordinary assemblies in which the neighbouring bishops met every half-year, at the principal city (whereof this was one, viz. St. Cyprian's neighbouring colleagues assembled at Carthage); but only those in which some extraordinary matter was handled.

Yet this is proper to observe here, That whereas * Grotius would prove that "infant baptism was not universally held to be *necessary*; because, in the councils, one finds no earlier mention of it than in the coun-

* Annot. in Matt. xix.

cil of Carthage;"— meaning that in the year 418. We see here, that though that were true (which I shall by and * by shew to be false) that there were no earlier mention of it in those councils that are in the ordinary collections; yet there is mention of it in this, that was earlier than any of them; and though met on ordinary occasions, more numerous than several of them.

It is objected likewise, that whereas St. Austin somewhere † lays down this as a rule, That "what the whole church through all the world does practise, and yet it has not been instituted in councils, but has been always in use, is, with very good reason, supposed to have been settled by authority of the apostles," and applies that rule to infant baptism; he consequently takes it not to have been instituted by any council; and, therefore, that he contradicts himself when he believes there was such a council as this letter mentions.

There needs nothing but for a man to open his eyes to see that this council does not *institute* the baptism of infants, or enact that they should be baptized; but takes that for granted, or as a thing known and supposed by both parties, that they are to be baptized; and determines only that question, Whether they may be baptized before the eighth day? — which very thing St. Austin notes in the words I just now cited (epist. 28) "Cyprian not making any new decree," &c.

Another exception that is made, has, I think, some truth in it, viz. That some of the reasons used in this council, and expressed in this letter, do appear something frivolous and shallow; but I do not see how it is at all to the purpose.

1. Because these reasons are not designed to prove infant baptism; but to take off the objections concerning the eighth day.

2. If they had been used by these bishops as grounds of infant baptism; yet since our enquiry is what the church then practised, and not how able St. Cyprian and

* Ch. 16. † De Baptismo contra Donatistas, lib. 4, c. 23.

they were to argue, their evidence is the same, how weak soever their reasonings are; but,

3. This also may be said in apology for their abilities, That, to a frivolous and foolish question or objection, it is almost impossible to give any answer that will not seem frivolous to those that consider not the occasion of it. On this account Irenæus, and many of the fathers, suffer in our judgment: they are forced to write a great deal in confutation of such idle and enthusiastical stuff as seems to us not to deserve three words; but it was necessary then to disentangle the souls of ignorant Christians; — so any book, written now in answer to the reasonings of the Quakers, &c. will, in the next age, seem to be the work of a man that had little to do. This Fidus thought that the natural uncleanness of an infant, in the first days after his birth, was a reason against baptizing it then; which, as Rigaltius observes, was a relic of Heathenish superstition. He also seems to have made some question whether so young an infant be a perfect human creature, — as if eight days made any great difference in that matter. The answers to such arguments will seem of little weight. All that he objected of sense, was, the rule of circumcision on the eighth day; — to which St. Cyprian answers, as other fathers do, That the circumstance of the day was typical, and so not now obliging.

If we look back from this time to the space that had passed from the apostles time, which was but 150 years, we must conclude that it was easy then to know the practice of Christians in the apostles days; for some of these 66 bishops must be thought to be at this time 70 or 80 years old themselves, which reaches to half the space; and at that time, when they were infants, there must have been several alive that were born within the apostles age; and such could not be ignorant whether infants were baptized in that age, when they themselves were some of those infants.

It is plain likewise that there was no dispute or difference of opinion (as there must have been among so

many, if any innovation had been made); for it is here said, "There was not one of Fidus's mind," that infant baptism must be delayed till the eighth day. Much less then was there any of opinion that it was not to be used at all.

"In a doctrinal point," as Mr. Baxter well observes, "a mistake is easier, or in a bare narration of some one fact; but in a matter of fact of so public notice, and which so many thousands were partakers in, as baptism was, how could they be ignorant?"

Suppose it were a question now among us, Whether persons were baptized at age only, or in infancy also, 70 or 80 years before we were born? — were it not easy to know the truth, what by tradition and what by records?

I shall conclude what I have to note on this testimony, with observing these things:—

1. That it was the custom of those times and places to give the new baptized person, whether infant or adult, the *kiss of peace*, or, as it is called by St. Paul (1 Cor. xvi. 20) and St. Peter (1 Pet. v. 14) *The Holy Kiss*, or *The Kiss of Charity*, in token of their owning him for a Christian brother; for Fidus makes that a part of his objection, that *that* would be indecent or loathsome in the case of a new-born infant, before it be a week old.

2. That these bishops held, That to suffer the infant to die unbaptized, was to endanger its salvation. This appears in their reasonings.

3. The third is a various reading or spelling of one word in this epistle, from whence some disputes have arisen. Mr. Daillè, in a book written on purpose to publish the *nævi* and errors which he could find in the fathers' works, reckons St. Cyprian one of the first of those from whose words one may prove there was a custom of giving the holy communion to infants; and he proves it first and chiefly from this epistle, in which,

* De Usu Patrum, lib. 2, c. 4.

as it is here written, there is never a word about it; but where we read in the first clause of it, *baptizandum et sanctificandum*, 'should be baptized and sanctified' (which latter word is commonly used as another word for *baptism*) he quotes it *baptizandum et sacrificandum*; by which he understands, "should be baptized, and partake of the Eucharist." Some editions, it seems, have it so; but, I suppose, very few; and those mistaken ones; — for * Dr. Hammond, † Marshal, and the *Magdeburgenses*, and Mr. Walker, and all that I have seen, do quote it *sanctificandum*, as it is also in the last edition, viz. Oxon. 1682; in which are the various lections of several manuscripts that had been collated, — but no variety in reading of this word; and the matter is out of doubt, since St. Austin, transcribing that part of the epistle ‡, writes it *sanctificandum*; and indeed, *sacrificandum*, in that sense, is not Latin.

From this use of the word *sanctification* for *baptism*, and *sanctified*, or made holy, for *baptized* (which I shall shew (ch. 11) hereafter to have been very common and usual) the fathers do give light to the explication of that text of St. Paul (1 Cor. vii. 14) as I shall more fully shew at a (ch. 11) fitter place.

4. We see also here confirmed what I said (ch. 2) before, That they reckoned baptism to be to us in the room of circumcision; for it was upon that account that Fidus thought it must keep the times of the old circumcision; and the bishops of the council, though denying that, do call it *The Spiritual* [or Christian] *Circumcision*.

ANOTHER PASSAGE OUT OF ST. CYPRIAN.

Libro de Lapsis, circa Medium.

There had been at Carthage a great persecution of the Christians, in which many had fallen, and had de-

* Six Queries on Infant Baptism, § 36.
† Against Tombs, p. 39.
‡ Lib. 4, contra duas epist. Pelagianorum, c. 8.

When he says "The infants lost [*or forfeited*] that [*gift or grace*] which they had obtained presently after they were born," it is plain that he means their baptism, or the benefits thereof. St. Austin had occasion to recite these words of St. Cyprian, and to give his comment on them. The occasion was this: — One Boniface had put to him this question, "Whether parents do their children, that are baptized, any hurt, when they carry them to the Heathen sacrifices to be cured of any illness? — and, if they thereby do them no hurt, then how it comes to pass that the faith of the parents stands them in stead when they are baptized, and yet their apostacy afterward should not be able to hurt them?"

St. Austin * answers, That "the force of that sacrament is such, that he that is once regenerated by it, cannot afterwards be entangled in the guilt of another person's sin, to which he does not consent." He gives the reason of the difference to this purpose, That the guilt of original sin descends from the parent to the child, because the child is not as yet a separate living person (*animà separatim vivens*) from his parent; but when a child is become (*in se ipso alter ab eo qui genuit*) in himself a separate person from him that begot him, he is not guilty of his parents sin done without his consent: he derived his guilt, because he was one with him and in him from whom he derived, at the time when it was derived to him; but one does not derive from another, when each has his own proper life; so as it may be said, *The soul that sinneth, it shall die.* That the faith and godly will of the parent in bringing his child to baptism is available; because the same Spirit that sanctifies and regenerates the child, moves the parent to offer him to baptism. "The regenerating spirit," says he, "is one and the same in the parents that bring him, and in the infant that is brought and regenerated. . . . And the guilt is not so communicated by another person's will, as the grace is communicated by the unity [*or identity*] of the Spirit. Yet (as he observes afterward) the pa-

* Epist. 22, ad Bonifacium.

rents or other guardians that endeavour thus to entangle their children or other infants in this sacrilege of the Devil, are deservedly called *Spiritual Murderers*; for they do not, it is true, effect any murder upon them; but yet, as far as it lies in them, they are murderers; and we do with reason say to them, 'Don't murder your infants;' for the apostle says *Quench not* [or extinguish not] *the Spirit*, — not that he can be extinguished; but yet they are fitly called Extinguishers of him, as much as in them lies, that would have him extinguished."

Then it is that he takes notice of this passage of St. Cyprian, and says "In this sense may that be rightly understood which St. Cyprian wrote in his epistle concerning the Lapsi, when reproving those that had in the time of persecution sacrificed to idols, he says, 'And 'that nothing might be wanting to the measure of their 'wickedness, their little infants also being led or 'brought in their parents arms, lost that which they had 'obtained presently after they were born,' &c. They lost it, he means, as far as concerns the wickedness of those by whom they were brought to lose it, in the will and purpose of those that committed so foul a wickedness upon them; for if they had lost it indeed as to themselves, they would have continued as persons to be condemned by the sentence of God without any excuse; which, if St. Cyprian had thought to be so, he would not presently have subjoined their excuse; saying, 'Will not they at the Day of Judgment say?' &c.

There is one place more in St. Cyprian, where he speaks of all persons in general; yet, because he names not infants particularly, I shall but just mention it; — it is

Libro 3, Testimoniorum ad Quirinum, c. 25.

This is a common-place book of the heads of Christian doctrine, collected by this father; and proper texts of Scripture added for the Proof of each of them.

The doctrine or proposition for this chapter is this: — *Ad regnum Dei, nisi baptizatus et renatus quis fue-*

rit, pervenire non posse. 'If any one be not bap-
'tized and regenerate, he cannot come to the kingdom
'of God.'

The texts of Scripture are, among other, these :—

"In evangelio secundum Joannem. Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex Aquâ et Spiritu, non potest introire in regnum Dei. Quod enim natum est de carne, caro est; et quod natum est de Spiritu, spiritus est." In the gospel according to St. John.

'Except any one be regenerate of water and of the
'Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;—
'*for that which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that*
'*which is born of the Spirit, is spirit.*'

We have in our English language a way of speaking, whereby, instead of the word *person* in a sentence, we generally use the word *man*, though the sense be such as requires to be understood of any human creature,—man, woman, or child; and so in the text of St. John here cited (John iii. 5) though the original be ἐὰν μὴ τὶς, &c.; and all Latin books and writers translate it, as Cyprian here does, *nisi quis*, &c. which signifies, *except one* [or except *any one*, or except *a person*] *be born*, &c.; yet the English translators have rendered it, *Except a man be born*, &c.; and some English Antipædobaptists (learned ones you will say) have taken the advantage of the word *man*, to prove that it is of a grown person, in exclusion of children, that our Saviour speaks; but the more wary of them finding that this argument will, from the original, turn strongly against them, are willing to compound, and leave this text quite out of the dispute, and say that our Saviour does not there speak of baptism at all.

There is not any one Christian writer of any antiquity in any language, but what understands it of baptism; and if it be not so understood, it is difficult to give an account how a person is born of *water*, any more than born of wood.

I shall have occasion to speak more * particularly of the sense of the antients concerning this text. In the mean time, we see here plainly that St. Cyprian understands it of baptism; and also we see by reading the foregoing epistle to Fidus, that he and his fellow-bishops understood the case of infants particularly to be included in it.

There is another passage in St. Cyprian, from which is plainly inferred the baptism of infants; because it shews that in this church the custom was to give the communion to them at the age of four or five years; but since it mentions not their baptism expressly, I shall reserve it to the † chapter where I speak of the custom that was in some churches of their communicating.

CHAPTER VII.

A QUOTATION OUT OF THE COUNCIL OF ELIBERIS.

[Year after the Apostles 205.]

Concil. Eliberitanum, Can. 22.

Si quis de Catholica Ecclesia ad hæresim transitum fecerit, rursusque ad ecclesiam recurrerit; placuit huic pœnitentiam non esse denegandam, eo quod cognoverit peccatum suum; qui etiam decem annis agat pœnitentiam; cui post decem annos præstari communio debet. Si vero infantes fuerint transducti, quod non suo vitio peccaverint, incunctanter recipi debent.

'If any one go over from the Catholic church to any 'heresy [*or sect*] and do return again to the church, it is 'resolved, That penance be not denied to such an one; 'because he acknowleges his fault. Let him be in the 'state of penance for ten years, and after ten years, he 'ought to be admitted to communion.

* Part 2, ch. 6. † Part 2, ch. 9.

'But if they were infants when they were carried over, 'inasmuch as it was not by their own fault that they 'sinned, they ought to be admitted presently.'

Here is indeed no express mention of these infants having been baptized in the Catholic church before they were carried over to the sect; but inasmuch as they are said to be *transducti*, 'carried over' from the Catholic church, it is, I think, plainly implied; for the phrase of all antiquity is not to call any one of the church till he be baptized. Be he infant or adult that is designed to be a Christian, till he be baptized, they call him *Catechumenus*; and a catechumen is not yet of the church. We perceive, by St. Austin, in many * places, that it was a common thing for the neighbours or any visitant, to ask concerning a Christian's infant child, Is he *fidelis* or *catechumenus*? *i. e.* Is he yet baptized or not? So that an infant or adult person was not reckoned *fidelis*, or of the church till his baptism; and, therefore, to speak of infants conveyed over from the Catholic church to any sect, is to suppose them first baptized in the Catholic church, and afterward, by their parents or others, carried to the congregations of the sectaries, and educated in that way. The council decrees that such, upon their return to the Catholic Church, shall be received without any penance.

Concerning the time of this council, I shall not enter into any of the nice inquiries. Almost all chronologers place it as I here do, viz. *Anno Dom.* 205. Baluzius will have it to be 10 or 15 years later. A main exception against moving the date of it any lower is, that a great many of the canons of it do enact what penance is necessary in the several cases of such as through fear do deny the Christian religion, or comply to sacrifice to the idol gods. This is a sign that persecution reigned at that time, at least in Spain; but every body knows that a little after this time, persecution for the Christian religion ceased in all the world.

* Serm. 14, de Verbis Apost. et alibi.

That which will make a reader that is not acquainted with antiquity, wonder is, that these ancient fathers do inflict so severe a penance on those that had run into any sect. They ordain that such must be kept in a state of penance (*i. e.* of humiliation, and asking pardon of God and the church) for ten years time before they be admitted to full communion, except they were infants when they were carried over.

The commonness of a sin does, in most men, wonderfully abate the sense of the guilt of it. Now-a-days, if men have run into schism, and do afterwards think fit to return to the church, they are so far from being sensible of any guilt that they have incurred, that they think their very return does lay a great obligation on the church. In short, many Christians that take the word of God, not as it lies, but as their prejudices have represented, do think that adultery indeed is a sin, and drunkenness is a sin, — but that schism is none.

All the ancient Christians do express the same sentiment of the guilt of schism as St. Paul does, who (Gal. v. 19, 20) reckons those that make divisions, seditions, and heresies in the church among the most capital offenders, *which shall not inherit the kingdom of God*; such as murderers, adulterers, &c.; and commands that they be excommunicated, or (Rom. xvi. 17.) avoided by all good Christians. Nor has God ever passed any act of indulgence or toleration in abatement of that law.

CHAPTER VIII.

A QUOTATION OUT OF THE COUNCIL OF NEOCÆSAREA.

[Year after the Apostles 214.]

THOUGH this council mentions nothing at all about infants or their baptism, yet Grotius * seems to himself

* Annot. in Mat. xix. 14.

to have found a proof out of it that many in that age judged that they are not to be baptized. Bishop Taylor * from him, and from them, others prosecute the argument.

So much is plain, that some about that time and place had put this question, Whether a woman with child, that had a mind to become a Christian and be baptized, might conveniently receive baptism during her going with child, or must stay till she was delivered? — and it is agreed likewise that the reason of the doubt was, because, when she was immersed into the water, the child in her womb did seem to some to be baptized with her; and consequently they were apt to argue that *that* child must not be baptized, or would not need to be baptized, afterward for itself. This any one will conclude from the words of the council, which are these: —

Concilij Neocæsariensis, Canon 6.

Περὶ κυοφορέσης ὅτι δεῖ φωτίζεσθαι ὁπότε βέλεται· Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐν τέτῳ κοινωννεῖ ἡ τίκτεσα τῷ τικτομένῳ· διὰ το ἑκάστε ἰδίαν την προαίρεσιν τὴν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δείκνυσθαι.

'A woman with child may be baptized when she 'pleases; for the mother in this matter communicates 'nothing to the child; because, in the profession, every 'one's own [*or peculiar*] resolution is declared, [or be-'cause every one's resolution, at the profession, is de-'clared to be peculiar to himself.]

The argument of the Antipædobaptists, from this passage, is, that both those that raised the doubt, and the council that resolved it, must have been of opinion that it is unlawful to baptize an infant; — for, say they, those men that scrupled the baptizing of a woman with child, scrupled it for this reason, because they thought that in so doing they baptized the child too; which to do had been no absurdity, supposing the baptism of an infant to be lawful: it would have been only the doing of both under one.

* Liberty of Prophesying.

And also the fathers of the council, say they, do seem to grant that the baptizing of the child would be unlawful; for they give that reason why they allow the baptizing of the woman, "because her baptism communicates nothing to the child."

Besides, the fathers (as these men construe their words) do determine that, in the baptismal profession, every person must declare his own choice or resolution; which it is impossible for the infant in the womb, or any other infant to do.

The Pædobaptists say, That this is a wide mistake of the meaning of those that raised the doubt, and of the council in resolving it; for that it was no more than this:—

They that scrupled the baptizing of such a woman, scrupled it for this reason, Because it would be a disputable case whether the child in her womb were to be accounted as baptized by its mother's baptism or not; and so when that child was born, they should be in great perplexity whether they must baptize it or not; for if they did, there would be danger that it would be baptized twice; and if they did not, it was questionable whether it had any baptism at all; and that therefore, it was better the woman should stay till she were delivered, and then she might be baptized for herself, and the child for itself.

The bishops in council (considering as it is likely, the danger of the woman's death in the meanwhile) determined otherwise, That she might be baptized if she would; and that there was no ground for the aforesaid scruple or perplexity about the child's baptism; for that it was a plain case that the child is not to be accounted as baptized by its mother's baptism; for that such a woman's baptism reaches no farther than herself, and is not communicated to the child in her womb; and give this reason, Because "the profession that any one makes at baptism, declares ἰδίαν προαίρεσιν a resolution [*or desire to be baptized*] that is peculiar to themselves;" and so the woman, in this case, does not desire or demand the baptism at that time for her child, but for herself only.

If the reader will please to turn back and read the words once again with any attention, he will see that they are, as to the main of the determination, applicable to either of these senses. If the bishops had thought baptizing of infants unlawful, they would have determined this case much as they do; but it is no kind of proof that they did think so; because if they meant only to take away the perplexity about baptizing the child, when born, they must also determine it as they do.

But the learned reader will likewise observe that there is something in the propriety of phrase in the last clause that does incline it to this latter sense; and that is the notation of the word ἴδιος, which properly signifies any thing *peculiar to one's self*; and the repetition of the article τῷ before the words ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ.

If the bishops had meant to determine that the child could not be supposed to be baptized with its mother for this reason, Because, in baptismal profession, every one must declare his own choice, and so an infant could not be baptized, they would have expressed that latter clause thus: — Διὰ τὸ ἕκαστον δεῖν ἑαυτῷ τὴν προαίρεσιν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δεικνύναι, 'Because every one must make his own choice at the profession." But when they say διὰ τὸ ἑκάστε ἰδίαν τὴν προαίρεσιν τὴν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δείκνυσθαι, they do (as any critic will observe) express this sense, "because the choice which is made at the [*baptismal*] profession, is declared by every one peculiar to himself;" and so it is only a reason of what they had said last, "that the mother communicates nothing to the child;" and not any reason against the baptizing of an infant.

Before I go farther, I esteem it very material to observe by the by this emphasis of the word ἴδιος, for apprehending the force of a text of St. Paul against the Polygamists. These men presume to say, that there is no prohibition in the New Testament of the plurality of wives to one man. St. Paul (1 Cor. vii. 1, 2) persuades people, if they can be so content, to an absolute continence; but if they cannot, he allows marriage; but

with this limitation, ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω, καὶ ἑκάστη τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἐχέτω. The true translation of which words is, 'Let every man have his own wife; 'and let every woman have a husband peculiar to her.' For, as when Aristotle says ἴδιον τοῦτο τοῖς ἀνθρώποις' it were a very imperfect rendering to translate it 'Men 'have this of their own;' — which ought to be 'This 'is proper or peculiar to men;' and when he says ὁ δὲ βάτραχος ἰδίαν ἔχει τὴν γλῶσσαν' to say 'Frogs make 'their own noise,' would not reach the sense; which is, that 'frogs make a noise peculiar to themselves;' — so it is an imperfect translation of the foresaid words of the apostle, which our English gives, "Let every woman have her own husband." The word signifies *one peculiar to her.*

But to return to our business: Grotius, among the arguments with which he endeavours to uphold the cause of the Antipædobaptists, produces two commentators on this canon, Balsamon and Zonaras, who (as he would represent their meaning) interpret it as if the council had understood infant baptism to be unlawful. Grotius's words are these: — * "How much soever the commentators draw it to another sense, it is plain that the doubt concerning the baptizing women great with child, was for that reason, because the child might seem to be baptized together with its mother; and a child was not wont to be baptized but upon its own will and profession;" and so Balsamon explains it (*Compend. Canon*, tit. 4) 'That cannot be enlightened [or baptized] be-'cause it is not yet come into the light, nor has any 'choice of the divine baptism;' — and also Zonaras, 'The child that is now in the womb has need of bap-'tism; then when it shall be able to choose.'

Any one that reads this, would conclude that Balsamon and Zonaras at least (if not the Neocæsarean fathers) were Antipædobaptists: if he be one that does not understand that there are most full and evident records of the time in which these two men lived (which

* Annot. in Matt. xix. 14.

was the 12th century); and that there was then no such thing as Antipædobaptism in the Greek church, in which Balsamon was patriarch of Antioch.

Rivet, Marshal, &c. do accuse Grotius of partiality and foul dealing in general, in his pleading the cause of the Antipædobaptists, and particularly in this place; and though the opinion of Balsamon and Zonaras be not of that moment to make it worth the while to repeat their words (since they had, at that distance, no better opportunity of knowing the mind of the council than we now have) yet I will set them down something at large, that the reader may see if he can acquit that great man of the crime of prevarication.

Balsamon's comment on that canon is this:—"Some had said, 'That women which come over from the Hea-' thens to the church great with child, ought not to be ' baptized, but to stay till they were delivered; lest, ' when the mother is baptized, the child in her womb ' do seem to be baptized too, as being altogether united ' to her; and so when it is born it will either be left un-' baptized, or, if it be baptized, it may be accounted to ' be twice baptized.' The fathers, therefore, not allowing this contradiction, appoiuted that such women may be baptized without any scruple when they please; for that the woman has nothing common with the child in her womb in the concern of baptism; especially, say they, when, as to every one in baptism, his own promising is necessary; but the embryo [εστερημένον διαθέσεως] having not the qualification [*or disposition, or affection*] cannot make the profession at baptism; and that clause, *when they please*, was added to the canon, because of some that say, 'Before the embryo be formed ' into a human creature, the woman may be baptized ' without any scruple, but not conveniently afterward; ' because the child in her womb then is in the same case ' as infants newly-born, which cannot make profession.' The fathers, therefore, said, 'That it is at the woman's pleasure to be baptized *when she will*; because in what state the embryo is none can tell, nor be sponsor for it; but infants do promise by their sponsors, and being ac-

tually baptized, have the heavenly illumination granted to them."

And in his *Glosses* upon Photius's *Nomocanon* (Tit. iv. c. 10) he says, "There was a question made, Whether a woman with child might be baptized? for some said, 'Because the child in the womb is united to the mother 'as a part of her, and cannot be enlightened [*or baptized*] with the mother, because it is not yet come into 'the light, nor has any choice of the profession of the 'divine baptism, therefore, the mother ought not to 'be baptized, but to stay till the child be born, — lest 'one part of her be enlightened, and the other remain 'unenlightened; and if the child be baptized with the 'mother's baptism, then, if it be baptized after it is 'born, it will prove to be twice baptized, which is absurd;' — therefore, the synod of Neocæsarea resolve the doubt in their sixth canon," &c.

Zonaras's words are these in his comment on the said canon: "It determines that women with child may be baptized when they please; and whereas some affirmed, 'that the *fœtus* is baptized together with the mother; and that, therefore, the infant, when born, must 'not be baptized, lest it should have a double baptism;' therefore, were those words added; *for the mother in this matter communicates nothing to the child*; *i. e.* for the mother only, and not the child, is made partaker of holy baptism; because, says it, for the profession of being joined to Christ, the choice of every one is re-required; and by it is shewn whether he come to holy baptism with a willing mind; and because, in the *fœtus* that is inclosed in the mother's womb, there is no choice, it is not to be accounted to have received baptism; and, therefore, it has need of baptism again when it shall be able to choose."

These two commentators do indeed understand the last clause of the canon in that sense, which I shewed even now not to be the true sense, nor according to the rules of critics; but yet it was not fair in Grotius to represent them as being themselves, or supposing the council to be against infant baptism; since, as it appears that they

suppose every one's choice to be necessary at baptism, so it likewise appears that an infant's choice and promise, made by its sponsors or godfathers, is the choice and promise they speak of. Besides that he, quoting scraps of sentences, produces as Balsamon's own words that which Balsamon had brought in as pleaded by others; and also something altered, as the reader will see by comparing.

The issue of the dispute is, The council say in this matter, what any one, whether Pædobaptist or Antipædobaptist, would say; and, therefore, the proof that they were of one or of the other opinion must be taken from some other evidence; for these words make neither for the one nor the other; and since we are now come so low as within 60 years of the time of St. Austin, Pelagius, &c. and they, as I shall shew* presently, do declare that they never read or heard of any Christian that were against infant baptism; it were a strange thing to suppose that there should have been a council so late as under the reign of Constantine (as this council was) and they never to have read or heard of it. No man can think but they had heard of this council, which was but a little before the time of their birth. It is plain, therefore, that they took the meaning of it not to have been against infant baptism.

St. Austin sometimes speaks of the case of a woman baptized while great with child; and he does not only determine it as these bishops do, but he speaks of it as a clear case, perhaps, because he knew it had been determined in this council. He takes occasion to mention it (lib. 6, *contra Julianum*, c. 5) where he is shewing the weakness of that argument of the Pelagians, who said, that if original sin be the cause why infants are baptized, then the child that was born of Christian and baptized parents would not need to be baptized, as being born of those that were cleansed of that sin, and of a mother whose body was the temple of the Holy Spirit. He says, among other things, this: —

* See ch. 19.

"That the mother's body should be the temple of God, is the benefit of grace, not of nature; which grace is conveyed not by birth, but by regeneration; for if that which is conceived in the mother's body did belong to it so as to be accounted a part of it, then an infant, whose mother was upon some danger of death, baptized while she was great with him, would not need to be baptized; but now, when such an infant is baptized, he will not be accounted twice baptized; therefore, when he was in the womb of his mother, he did not appertain to it; and yet he was formed in a temple of God, but so as not to be himself the temple of God; and he has the same instance over again." C. 6.

Some learned men have given their conjectures of the occasion of this doubt, viz. What should make some people of this country take up an opinion, that if a woman with child were baptized, her child, when born, would have no need of baptism? — and they give a very * probable account of it. Several Jews were dispersed in these parts; and the rabbies of the Jews had this rule concerning the baptism of proselytes, "If a woman great with child become a proselyte, and be baptized, her child needs not baptism when it is born;" as I shewed in the Introduction.

CHAPTER IX.

A QUOTATION OUT OF OPTATUS MILEVITANUS,

[Year after the Apostles 260],

THIS bishop, living in Africa, had occasion to write several books against the schism of the Donatists. Some part of the controversy between them and the Catholics was about baptism; but not about infant baptism, as a certain writer of small reading has mistaken the matter.

* Hammond's Six Queries on Infant Baptism, § 109. Lightfoot's Hor. Hebr. Matt. iii.

It was Whether baptism, given by an ill minister, were valid, or must be renewed? — and, Whether the Catholics were so corrupt a church as that all baptized by them, whether in infancy or at age, must be baptized afresh by some such pure men as the Donatists were?

Otherwise, the doctrine and practice of baptism was the same with both the parties.

This appears plainly by what this author * says, in way of persuading them to break off their schism, "The ecclesiastical management is one and the same with us and you. Though men's minds are at variance, the sacraments are at none; and we may say, we believe alike, and are sealed with one and the same seal, — *no otherwise baptized than you*, nor otherwise ordained than you are. We read the Scripture alike; we pray to the same God. The Lord's Prayer is the same with us and you," &c. The same thing is † affirmed by St. Austin. He owns their baptism, ordination, &c. to be rightly performed, — he blames nothing in them but their separation; and by Cresconius, the Donatist, who has these words to the Catholics, ‡ "There is between us and you one religion, the same sacraments, nothing in the Christian ceremonies different. It is a schism that is between us; not a heresy."

But that which I mean to quote, and is all that he has occasion to say about infant baptism is this:—

Lib. Quinto, de Schismate Donatistarum, prope finem.

He had been there comparing a Christian's putting on Christ in baptism, to the putting on of a garment; and had called Christ, so put on, *Tunicam natantem in aquis*, — 'a garment swimming in the water;' — and then says,

"Sed ne quis dicat, temere a me Filium Dei vestem

* Lib. 3, de Schismate Donatist. prope finem.
† Epist. ad Theodorum Donatist.
‡ Apud Augustinum, lib. 2, contra Cresconium, c. 3.

esse dictum: legat apostolum dicentem; quotquot in nomine Christi baptizati estis, Christum induistis. O tunica semper una, et innumerabilis, quæ decenter vestiat et omnes ætates et formas: nec in infantibus rugatur, nec in juvenibus tenditur, nec in fæminis mutatur."

'But, lest any one should say I speak irreverently, 'in calling Christ a garment, let him read what the 'apostle says: *As many of you as have been baptized 'in the name of Christ, have put on Christ.* Oh! 'what a garment is this, that is always one, and never 'renewed; that decently fits all ages and all shapes! 'it is neither too big for infants, nor too little for men; 'and, without any alteration, fits women.'

He goes on to shew how it may be also compared to the wedding-garment, &c. This needs no note.

CHAPTER X.

A QUOTATION OUT OF ST. GREGORY NAZIANZEN, CONCERNING ST. BASIL'S BAPTISM IN HIS INFANCY.

[Year after the Apostles 260.]

THIS quotation might have been placed 30 or 40 years sooner (at which time St. Basil must have been born) because it recites a matter of fact done then. But I set it at this year, because this author that mentions it began at this time to be a man of note in the church (a presbyter and a writer of books, &c.) though he preached the sermon that I shall cite about 20 years after.

Some that have gone about to draw up a catalogue of persons not baptized in infancy, though born of Christian parents, have reckoned St. Basil among them: but the evidence they bring is out of spurious and forged authors, as I shall shew in its place*. And in the

* Part 2, c. 3.

mean time I shall produce the authority of a piece that all acknowledge to be genuine, which, I think, shews that he was baptized in infancy.

St. Gregory Nazianzen was contemporary with St. Basil, and so well acquainted with him, as that it is impossible any one should have been more; and though he seems to have been something the older man, yet he lived to preach a sermon in commendation of him, in the nature of a funeral sermon, though it was some time after his death.

In that sermon he recites several passages of his parentage, birth, life, and death; and among them the passage, which I take to relate to his baptism, is penned in such a rhetorical and figurative periphrasis, that, taking it by itself, one is not sure whether he means baptism by it or something else. But, since the first reading of it, I have observed in another discourse of his, the very same description applied plainly and purposely to baptism; which, together with the probability that it carries in itself, convinces me (and I suppose will the reader when he compares them) that it is so to be applied in that sermon concerning St. Basil.

I shall first give the words by which he describes baptism in his *Oratio in Sanctum Baptisma*, Orat. 40 *.

Τρίσσην γένεσιν ἡμῖν οἶδεν ὁ λόγος, τὴν ἐκ σωμάτων, τὴν ἐκ βαπτίσματος, καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἀναστάσεως. Τούτων δὲ ἡ μὲν νυκτερινή τέ ἐστι, καὶ δούλη, καὶ ἐμπαθής. Ἡ δὲ ἡμερινὴ, καὶ ἐλευθέρα, καὶ λυτικὴ παθῶν, πᾶν τὸ ἀπὸ γενέσεως καλυμμα περιτέμνουσα, καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἄνω ζωὴν ἐπανάγουσα, ἡ δὲ φοβερωτέρα, καὶ συντομωτέρα, πᾶν τὸ πλάσμα συνάγουσα ἐν βραχεῖ τῷ πλάστῃ παρασταθησόμενον.

'Religion teaches us that there are three sorts of 'generation or formation: that of our bodies, that of 'baptism, and that of the resurrection. The first of 'these is of the night, and is servile, and tainted with 'lust. The second is of the day, and is free, and pow'erful against lust, and takes away all that veil [or

* Prope ab initio.

'*darkness*] contracted in our birth [*or generation*] and 'renews us to the supernal life. The last is more 'dreadful and sudden, bringing together in a moment 'all the creation to be set before their Creator.'

And a little after, among other titles that he gives to baptism, he calls it πλάσματος ἐπανόρθωσιν, 'the amend-'ment [*or rectifying*] of our formation.'

All that I produce this here for, is to observe the phrase or description that he gives to baptism. He calls our natural generation Nocturnal, or of the night; but the baptismal generation, Diurnal, or of the day. And Nicetas there observes, that the name is taken from those words of David (Psal. cxxxix. 16.) where the translation of the Septuagint (which was in use with them) reads (much different from our English) καὶ τὸ βιβλίον σου πάντες γραφήσονται, ἡμέρας πλασθήσονται· — 'They shall all be written in thy book; they shall be 'formed by day.'

Now see what he says of St. Basil, *Orat. in laudem Basilij.* Orat. 20.

He had spoken of his progenitors, many of whom were martyrs for Christ, and of the piety of his father Basil, who, it seems, was a man in holy orders; and of his mother Emmelia: and making an end of that prefatory discourse, he says,—

Φέρε τα κατ' αὐτὸν θεωρήσωμεν. Τὰ μὲν δὴ πρῶτα τῆς ἡλικίας ὑπὸ τῷ μεγάλῳ πατρὶ, ὃν κοινὸν παιδευτὴν ἀρετῆς ὁ Πόντος τηνικαῦτα προυβάλλετο, σπαργανοῦται καὶ διαπλάττεται πλάσιν τὴν ἀρίστην τε καὶ καθαρωτάτην, ἣν ἡμερινὴν ὁ θεῖος Δαβὶδ καλῶς ὀνομάζει, καὶ της νυκτερινῆς ἀντίθετον.

'Now let us contemplate the affairs that relate to 'him himself. In the beginning then of his age he was 'by his excellent father, who was at that time a public 'teacher of virtue in the country of Pontus, swaddled, 'as I may call it, and formed with that best and most 'pure formation, which divine David rightly names of 'the Day, and which is opposed to that of the Night.'

Bilius, in his note on these words, says, He means the formation of baptism, or rather of manners; which David calls *of the day*, saying, they shall be formed by day; for so it is to be read: which excellent formation is opposite to that of the night, which is by copulation, and is sordid, and a work of darkness.

But I believe Bilius had not animadverted (what I here observe) that it is the very same phrase which he uses in the other sermon for baptism. I also at the first reading thought it uncertain which he meant, baptism, or good education in manners; but the likeness of a phrase so singular seems to determine it. They of that time seem to have understood that verse of the psalm, as speaking before of the Christian baptism.

This formation appears to have been given in infancy, both by the words τὰ πρῶτα τῆς ἡλικίας, "in the beginning of his age;" and also by the emphasis of the word σπαργανῶται, which signifies the binding or first fashioning of the body of an infant in swaddling clothes; and also by the orderly method in which he proceeds: for he mentions in the next paragraph to this his childhood, in which he was educated at home, and by the instructions that are first in order and proper for a child fitted for the perfection he was to arrive at afterward; therefore the foregoing paragraph must have referred to his infancy. Then he proceeds to tell, that when he was a boy big enough, he was sent to school to Cæsarea, then to Byzantium, and then to the university of Athens; where it was that Gregory, who knew him before (at Cæsarea I suppose) entered, as he says, into that strict league of friendship with him which lasted during their joint lives, and in which they seemed, as he expresses it, to have both but one soul informing two bodies. After this he relates how he went into orders, and came, in process of time, to be bishop of Cæsarea, and so famous a man as he was.

From this methodical enumerating all the material passages and actions of his life, arises another proof that he must have been baptized in infancy, and that the

passage which I mentioned must be meant of that; because, in all the passages of his life afterward, he never mentions any thing of his baptism, which it had been impossible to omit if he had received it after any considerable time of his life had passed. Also I do not see what else he can mean than St. Basil's baptism in infancy, by another expression which he has in the same Oration. He is comparing Basil to each of the patriarchs and holy men of the Old Testament, Abraham, Moses, &c.; and he shews how he had something in his temper, and in the passages of his life, like to something in every one of theirs. Among the rest, he compares him to Samuel, and says, —

Σαμουὴλ ἐν τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ δοτὸς πρὸ γενήσεως, καὶ μετὰ τὴν γέννησιν εὐθὺς ἱερὸς, καὶ χρίων βασιλέας καὶ ἱερέας διὰ τοῦ κέρατος. Οὗτος δὲ ἐκ ἐκ βρέφους καθιερωμένος ἀπὸ μήτρας, καὶ μετὰ τῆς διπλοιδος ἐπιδεδομένος τῷ βήματι; καὶ βλέπων τὰ ἐπουράνια, καὶ χριστὸς Κυρίου, καὶ χρίστης τῶν τελειωμένων ἐκ Πνεύματος;

'Samuel, among them that call upon his name, was 'both given [*or promised*] before he was born, and pre-'sently after his birth was consecrated; and he became 'an anointer of kings and priests out of a horn. And 'was not this man (Basil) consecrated to God in his 'infancy from the womb, and carried to the steps [*or 'font*] in a coat? Did he not become a seer of hea-'venly things, and an anointed of the Lord, and an 'anointer of such as were initiated by the Spirit?'

The word Βῆμα properly signifies steps. It is ordinarily taken for a pulpit, to which one goes up by steps; and it may signify a font or baptistery, to which they did go down by steps. But the coat in which he says Basil was offered to God (alluding to the child's coat which was made for Samuel by his mother) cannot well be supposed to have been any thing but the *albes* used at baptism: and this, he says, was in his infancy.

The instance of Samuel dedicated in infancy, is one which this father does at other places make use of for a

comparison or example of a Christian's child baptized in infancy, as will be seen in the next chapter; where, speaking to some tender mothers that were afraid, it seems, of putting their infants into the water at baptism, he says, Thou art afraid, as a faint-hearted mother, &c. But Hannah, before Samuel was born, devoted him to God; and, when he was born, presently consecrated him, and brought him up in a priestly coat. The very thing that he says here of St. Basil's parents.

CHAPTER XI.

OTHER QUOTATIONS OUT OF ST. GREG. NAZIANZEN, CONCERNING THE DOCTRINE OF INFANT BAPTISM.

[Year after the Apostles 260.]

THIS father was not himself baptized in infancy; and if it be true that he was born after the time that his father was a Christian and in holy orders (of which the Antipædobaptists do give probable evidence) he had the most reason of any one in those times to be prejudiced against the doctrine of the necessity of infant baptism, which he could not urge himself, nor hear urged by others, without some reproach thereby cast on the conduct of his father, for whom he always expressed a great reverence, though other writers give him but a mean character, and shew that the * son's prudence and skill was found necessary to retrieve the father's credit and the esteem of the people, and to preserve him from being overwitted by the Arians, or frighted by their power.

So much is certain, that of all the instances brought by the Antipædobaptists of men who, being baptized Christians themselves, yet did not baptize their children in infancy, there is a better appearance of proof in this man's father's case than in any other; of which instances I must treat more largely in a † chapter on purpose;

* Greg. Presbyter in Vita Naz. † Part 2. c. 3.

and, at present give account of what this author himself speaks of the doctrine of infant baptism.

All that I have to produce is taken out of his sermon that I mentioned before, viz. his *Oratio de Baptismo*, Or. 40; in which he both persuades those of his hearers who had not yet so thoroughly embraced Christianity as to be baptized into it, that they would without delay be partakers of it; and also speaks something concerning the necessity of it to infants.

Of this oration I will give a short abstract, setting down the original of such passages only as do some way affect the question in hand.

After some commendations of baptism, he proceeds to mention the names or titles by which it is called, which are these: the gift, the grace, baptism or washing, the anointing, the laver of regeneration, the amending of our make, or formation, the seal; and explains the reason of these several appellations.

Having spoken of man's natural and original corruption, he says, "God has not left his creature without a remedy; but as he first made us, so he renews us by this divine formation: ἡ τοῖς μὲν αρχομένοις ἐστὶ σφραγὶς, τοῖς τελειοτέροις τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ χάρισμα, καὶ τῆς πεσούσης εἰκόνος διὰ τὴν κακίαν ἐπανόρθωσις· which, as it is a seal for such persons as newly enter into life,—so to those that are adult it is a grace, and the restoring of the image which they had lost.

Then he says, The force and effect of baptism is a covenant with God of a new and holy life; and argues from thence how careful we ought to be to keep it entire: and that, says he, ἐκ ἕσης δευτέρας ἀναγεννήσεως, 'because there is no regeneration to be had afterward.' Yet he grants there is repentance afterward; but that leaves a scar, and requires a long time, and many tears, which we know not whether God will give us a space for:—they, as I observed before, gave the name of regeneration to no other but the baptismal renewing.

Then he warns them of the temptations that they must expect after their baptism, and how they must oppose and overcome them.

Against the delay of baptism he minds them of the danger of missing it by sudden death; and how much more creditable and comfortable it is to receive it voluntarily in the time of health and strength, than in time of necessity on a sick-bed, when the tongue falters, and can hardly utter the words of the holy initiation; and the washing is more like the washing of a corpse than religious baptism: that a generous mind will desire not only the forgiveness of sins, but also the reward promised to virtuous actions, for which there must some time be allowed between baptism and death: that there are three sorts of persons very different, though all of them may be saved — the slave, the mercenary, and the son. The first minds no more than the escaping of punishment; the second regards nothing but the pay; the son's mind is full of duty and love to his father: that all other good things we desire to enjoy as soon as may be; and so we ought to do this freedom from sin.

That the Devil would indeed entice us to give him the present, and God the remainder; him the flower of our age, and God the dregs: but that we must consider the many hazards we are subject to — the chance of war, an earthquake, the sea, a wild beast, a disease, a crumb of bread, a surfeit, a precipice, a horse, a medicine, a tyrant, &c. Then he answers the pretences which the half Christians of those times made for their delay. As "I am afraid I shall not keep the grace of baptism unstained, and so will not take my cleansing yet, as having none to take afterward. — Oh! crafty imposture, says he, of the evil Spirit! He is indeed darkness, yet he counterfeits light: when he does not prevail by open war he lays his snares: when he cannot bring thee to despise baptism, he would cheat thee of it by over much caution, &c. He sets on all ages, and must be resisted in all. Art thou a youth? fight against pleasures and passions with this auxiliary strength: list thyself in God's army, &c. — Art thou old? let thy grey hairs hasten thee; strengthen thy old age with baptism," &c. — Νήπιόν ἐστι σοί; μὴ λαβέτω ταμὸν ἡ κακία, ἐκ βρέφους ἁγιασθήτω, ἐξ ὀνύχων καθιερωθήτω

τῷ Πνεύματι. Σὺ δεδοικὰς τὴν σφραγῖδα διὰ τὸ φυσικῶς ἀθενὲς, ὡς μικρόψυχος ἡ μήτηρ καὶ ὀλιγόπιστος. Οὐ Ἄννα δὲ καὶ πρὶν ἢ γενηθῆναι τὸν Σαμουὴλ καθυπέσχετο τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ γεννηθέντα ἱερὸν εὐθὺς ποιεῖ, καὶ τῇ ἱερατικῇ στολῇ συναναθρέψεν, ἀ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον φοβηθεῖσα, τῷ δὲ Θεῷ πιστεύσασα.

'Hast thou an infant child? Let not wickedness have the advantage of time: let him be sanctified from his infancy: let him be dedicated from his cradle to [*or, by*] the Spirit. Thou, as a faint-hearted mother, and of little faith, art afraid of giving him the seal, because of the weakness of nature. Hannah, before Samuel was born, devoted him to God, and as soon as he was born, consecrated him, and brought him up from the first in a priestly garment, not fearing for human infirmities, but trusting in God. Thou hast no need of amulets or charms, together with which the Devil slides into the minds of shallow persons, drawing to himself the veneration that is due to God. Δὸς αὐτῷ τὴν τριάδα, τὸ μέγα καὶ καλὸν φυλακτήριον. Give to him the Trinity, that great and excellent preservative.'

He proceeds to stir up all persons in all estates and employments to receive baptism; only he would advise those that had places in Court to resign and fly from Sodom, if conveniently they could, when they were baptized. It is to be noted that Valens, a wicked and Arian Emperor, reigned at that time. If they could not conveniently, yet to be baptized, and preserve the purity thereof as well as they could in so ill a station: that God in judging of our lives makes allowance for the circumstances that we are in: that for a man that is fettered to get forward a little, is as great praise as for another to run; for one that travels in a dirty road to be but a little bespattered, is more remarkable than for another to be clean.

He next sets upon those men that put off their baptism to death or old age, for the love of their sinful pleasures, which they were unwilling as yet to part with; who said "Where is the advantage of taking baptism so soon, and thereby cutting one's self off from all the

worldly pleasures and delights? whereas one may enjoy these pleasures in the meanwhile, and then be baptized at last; for they that went the earliest to labour in the vineyard, sped no better than they that came in the latest."

He answers:—"You have saved me a great deal of trouble by your making this plea; for you have at last, with much ado, discovered the very secret of this delay: and though I dislike your wicked purpose, yet I commend you for one thing, that you own it without disguise.

"Come on, then, and give the sense of this parable; and be not ignorantly scandalized [*or drawn into sin*] by this place of Scripture.

"First, this is not meant of baptism, but of those who come, some sooner, some later, to the faith [*or the knowledge of Christian religion*] and enter the vineyard, the church; for every one must labour from that day and hour on which he comes to the faith, &c.

"Besides, supposing by entering the vineyard, baptism be meant: the parable shews that those that do at all enter the vineyard and labour shall have a reward. But you are in danger to miss of doing that. If you were sure that, notwithstanding this wicked contrivance to avoid labouring, you should at last obtain baptism, you might be pardoned in this sordid cunning; but since there is danger, that while you take this advantage you will quite miss of the vineyard, &c. take my counsel: Lay aside these subtilties, and come with an honest mind to baptism, lest you be taken out of this life before you attain your purpose, and be found to have devised these fallacies to your own destruction."

But you will say 'Is not God merciful enough to take 'in such a case the desire of baptism for baptism?'

"You would have us believe a monstrous thing, if you think that God, because he is merciful, will count him enlightened that is not; and take him into the kingdom of Heaven that wishes for it, but does not perform the things that make the way to it. I will tell you what is my opinion of this matter; in which, I believe, considering men will agree with me.

"As there are several sorts of those who do obtain the gift of baptism; some were before extremely wicked, &c.; others, &c. —— so it is likewise in those who miss of baptism: for some of them live like beasts, and regard not baptism, &c. Some have a value for baptism, but delay the receiving of it, either out of negligence, or δ' ἀπληστίαν out of greediness, longer to enjoy their lusts: Ὅι δὲ ὅδε εἰσὶν ἐν δυνάμει τ' δέξασθαι, ἢ διὰ νηπιότητα τυχὸν, ἤ τινα τελέως ἀκάσιον περιπέτειαν, ἐξ ἧς ὅδε βελομένοις ἀυτοῖς ὑπάρχει τυχεῖν τȣ χαρίσματος. But some others have it not in their own power to receive it, either because of their infancy perhaps, or by reason of some accident utterly involuntary; so that though they desire it, they have no opportunity to obtain the gift: as therefore we found much difference among those [*that do obtain baptism*] so there is among these [*that miss of it.*]

"They that wholly scorn it are worse than the negligent, or those that crave longer time: but these are worse than those who fail of the gift ἐξ ἀγνοίας ἢ τυραννίδος by ignorance or constraint: τυραννὶς γὰρ ȣ̓κ ἀλλό τι ἢ ἀκȣσιός διαμαρτία, for constraint is no other thing than to miss against one's will.

"And I think of the first sort, that they shall be punished as for their other wickedness, so for their slighting of baptism; and that the second shall be punished, but in a less degree, because they are guilty of their own missing it, but rather through folly than malice. Τȣ̀ς δὲ μητὲ δοξασθήσεσθαι μητὲ κολασθήσεσθαι παρὰ τȣ̃ δικαὶȣ κριτȣ̃, ὡς ἀσφραγίστȣς μὲν, ἀπονήρȣς δὲ ἀλλὰ παθόντας μᾶλλον τὴν ζημίαν ἢ δράσαντας: but that the last sort will neither be glorified nor punished by the just Judge, as being without the seal, but not through their own wickedness; and as having suffered the loss rather than occasioning it.

"For he that is not worthy of punishment, is not, therefore, presently worthy of honour; as he that is not worthy of honour, does not therefore deserve punishment.

"And I think thus also: If you would condemn for murder a man that has not murdered, merely because he had a mind so to do, then let him go with you for a baptized person, who had a mind to it, but had it not. But if that be absurd, I don't see how this can be reasonable.

"Or, if you please, take it thus: If to obtain the effect of baptism you think it sufficient that you desired baptism, and thereupon claim the glory of Heaven, let the desire of that glory suffice you instead of the glory itself: for what matter is it if you go without it, so long as you have the desire of it."

He next blames those that pretended they would stay till Epiphany, or Easter, or Whitsuntide, and then be baptized. "What will come of this?" says he, "the end of your life will come on a sudden; in a day and hour that you think not of," &c.

Those that would stay for the presence of their friends and relations, or till they had got ready an offering for the church, or a present for the baptizer, or a handsome white garment, or provision for a treat, he chides in these words:—"These things, I warrant you, are mighty necessary; and the grace of baptism will be never the less for want of these. In things of great consequence, do not stand upon trifling matters; this sacrament is of higher concern, &c.; for an offering give yourself; put on Christ; treat me with your commendable life; God values nothing but those things which the poor have to give as well as the rich," &c.

It is in like manner that he reproves such as stood on height and punctilios, that would have a bishop, or a metropolitan, or the Bishop of Jerusalem, or (if it were a priest) one that led an unmarried life for their baptizer; or that scorned to be baptized together with a poor man; or counted the length of the service too tedious.

He tells them the most acceptable posture or preparation to receive it is a heart inflamed with the desire of it; that God takes that for a kindness if we be earnestly

desirous of his kindnesses; he takes more pleasure in giving than others in receiving, &c.

He concludes that paragraph with saying "We must therefore make it our utmost care that we do not miss of the common grace;" and then follow these words:—

Ἔστω ταῦτα, φησὶ περὶ τῶν ἐπιζητούντων τὸ βάπτισμα· τί δ' ἂν εἴποις περὶ τῶν ἔτι νηπίων, καὶ μήτε τῆς ζημίας ἐπαισθανομένων, μήτε τῆς χάριτος; ἢ καὶ ταῦτα βαπτίσομεν; Πάγυγε, εἴπερ τὶς ἐπείγῃ κινδυνος. Κρεῖσσον γὰρ ἀναιθήτως ἁγιασθῆναι, ἢ ἀπελθεῖν ἀσφράγιστα, καὶ ἀτέλεστα. Καὶ τοῦτο λόγος ἡμῖν ἡ ὀκταήμερος περιτομὴ, τυτική τις οὖσα σφραγὶς, καὶ αλογίστοις ἔτι προσαγομένη· ὡς δὲ καὶ ἡ τῶν φλιῶν χρίσις διὰ τῶν ἀναισθήτων φυλάττουσα τὰ πρωτότκα. Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων δίδωμι γνώμην, τὴν τριετίαν ἀναμένοντας, ἢ μικρὸν ἐντὸς τούτου, ἢ ὑπὲρ τούτου, ἡνίκα καὶ ἀκοῦσαι τὶ μυστικὸν καὶ ἀποκρίνεσθαι δύνανται, εἰ καὶ μὴ συνιέντα τελείως ἀλλ' ὧν τυπούμενα, ὅτως ἁγιάζειν καὶ ψυχὰς καὶ σώματα τῷ μεγάλῳ μυστηρίῳ τῆς τελειώσεως.

'Some may say, Suppose this to hold in the case of 'those that can desire baptism,—what say you to 'those that are as yet infants, and are not in capa-'city to be either sensible of the grace or the miss of 'it? Shall we baptize them too? Yes, by all means, 'if any danger make it requisite; for it is better that 'they be sanctified without their own sense of it, than 'that they should die unsealed and uninitiated. And a 'ground of this to us is circumcision, which was given 'on the eighth day, and was a typical seal [*or baptism*] 'and was practised on those that had no use of rea-'son: as also the anointing of the door-posts, which 'preserved the first-born by things that have no sense. 'As for others, I give my opinion that they should stay 'three years or thereabouts, when they are capable to 'hear and answer some of the holy words; and though 'they do not perfectly understand them, yet they form 'them; and that you then sanctify them in soul and 'body with the great sacrament of initiation; for 'though they are not liable to give account of their 'life before their reason be come to maturity (they 'having this advantage by their age, that they are not 'forced to account for the faults they have committed

' in ignorance') πεπεισμένοι δὲ καὶ λουτρῷ παντὶ λόγῳ λυσιτελέστερον διὰ τὰς ἐξαίφνης παρεμπιπτούσας ἡμῖν προσβολὰς τῶν κινδύνων, καὶ βοηθείας ἰσχυροτέρας; 'yet, by reason 'of those sudden and unexpected assaults of dangers 'that are by no endeavour to be prevented, it is by all 'means advisable that they be secured by the laver [*of* 'baptism.']

Then he answers the objection or pretence which some made from our Saviour's being 30 years old before he was baptized; shewing the disparity in a great many particulars; one is this: That there was no danger in his delaying, who needed no purgation; and, besides, had the time of his death as well as of his birth at his own disposal. "But to you (says he) there is a great deal of danger, if you should depart this life, having been begotten in corruption, and not being clothed with incorruption and immortality."

The rest of the sermon is spent partly in teaching them how to prepare themselves, viz. by fasting, watching, prayer, alms-deeds, restitution of goods ill gotten in the time of their heathenism (for, he says, though in baptism they are pardoned all past sins, yet he that keeps in his hands after baptism any thing that is in justice due to another, continues in the sin; to keep it is a present sin, though the act of stealing it be a past one) and partly in charging on their consciences the necessity of keeping their baptismal vow when they have made it: in shewing the wretched estate from which they are delivered, the happy one into which they are going to be entered, and the dreadful one into which they will fall if they revolt: and partly in explaining the creed and faith into which they are baptized; where he especially insists on the belief of the Holy Trinity (for these were times in which the Arian heresy was rife) of which having spoken largely, and answered the charge of Tritheism cast on the Catholics, and other objections of the Arians, he declares he will baptize none of them that do not own this faith. "And if you do still halt (says he) and do not own the Divinity full and perfect, seek for some body else to baptize [*or dip*] you, or ra-

ther drown [*or destroy*] you; for I have no mind to divide the Deity, and at the time of your new birth to bring death on you, — so that you will have neither baptism, nor the hope of the grace, your salvation being quickly shipwrecked; for if you deny divinity to any of these Three, you overthrow the whole [*Trinity*] and make your baptism of no force [*or benefit*] to you."

He concludes with giving the meaning of some ceremonies then used at baptism, particularly of the *lamps* they lighted and held in their hands, denoting those of the wise virgins that were prepared to meet their Lord; of which parable he makes a godly application to them.

Among the things that we are to observe from this oration, this ought to be one: —

1. The strange mistake that Grotius made when he went * about to disprove the ancient practice of infant baptism from this very sermon, in which there is nothing more or otherwise said of that matter than I have recited. He takes a few words out of this discourse, and even out of the passages here recited, where Gregory speaks of some † οἱ οὐδὲ εἶναι ἐν δυνάμει τὸ δέχεσθαι, διὰ νηπιότητα τυχόν, ἢ τινα τελέως ἀκούσιον περιπέτειαν, 'who 'have not the receiving of baptism in their own power, 'either for their infancy perhaps, or by reason of some 'accident utterly involuntary;' of whom it is said, a little after, that they lose the kingdom of Heaven by so dying unbaptized, but yet escape punishment, because it was not their fault. He takes out of these words, the words διὰ νηπιότητα by themselves, and makes this use of them: that Gregory, mentioning some "that are not baptized (διὰ νηπιότητα) by reason of their infancy," imports that infants were not wont to be baptized; whereas it imports only, that an infant, if he have no body to help him to it, is incapable of having baptism.

2. It appears most evidently, by the tenor of this sermon, that Nazianzen held, concerning baptism, these tenets: —

* Annot. in Mat. xix. 14. † Supra, § 6.

1. That all who died unbaptized, by their own fault or negligence, were condemned.

2. He thought that infants dying unbaptized, and adult persons who mist of baptism by some unavoidable impediment, and not by their own fault, were in a kind of middle state, between happiness and torment; but that baptized infants were partakers of the kingdom of Heaven.

3. Where there is no danger of an infant's death, he has a particular opinion (which he accordingly expresses thus, * δίδωμι γνώμην, 'I give my opinion') That his baptism should be delayed till he is three years old; which would please neither the Pædobaptist nor Antipædobaptist.

He seems to have taken up this opinion in some degree of compliance with his father's practice, who probably had kept him unbaptized so long purposely, and then, seeing no danger of death, delayed it farther from time to time.

This man and Tertullian are the only two that speak of delaying it at all: — one, till the age of reason; the other, till three years. Both one and the other are to be understood where there is no danger of death in the meanwhile; which is plainly expressed here; and in Tertullian is collected from his other speeches.

3. He uses, three or four times in this oration (as he does also frequently in his other works) the word ἁγιασθῆναι *to be sanctified* [or made holy] for baptism; and so did St. Cyprian, in his words before cited (ch. 6) and other places; and so do the antients generally. Mr. Walker † has taken the pains to produce quotations out of almost all the ancient writers, to shew that this was a common phrase with them to say, an infant or other person *sanctified*, when they mean *baptized*; and I do, for brevity's sake, refer the reader to his book. The Scripture also uses it so, 1 Cor. vi. 11; and Eph. v. 26; which makes that explication of 1 Cor. vii. 14, *Now*

* Supra. † Modest Plea for Infant Baptism, ch. 29.

are your children holy, which is given by Tertullian, St. Austin, St. Hierom, Paulinus, Pelagius (ch. 19) and other antients, and since by Dr. Hammond *, Mr. Walker †, &c. much the more probable; whereby they make the words (ἅγια) *holy*, and (ἡγίασται) *has been sanctified*, to refer to baptism.

Their explication is also the more probable, because there has no other sense of those words been yet given by expositors but what is liable to much contest; but especially that sense which some Antipædobaptists have endeavoured to affix to them (of legitimacy, in opposition to bastardy) seems the most forced and far-fetched of all. The words are Ἡγίασται γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ, καὶ ἡγίασται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀνδρὶ· ἐπεὶ ἄρα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτά ἐστι, νῦν δὲ ἅγιά ἐστιν. The grammatical translation of which words is, 'For the unbelieving 'husband [*or an unbelieving husband*] has been sanctified by the wife; and the unbelieving wife [*or an unbelieving wife*] has been sanctified by the husband. 'Else your children would be unclean; but now they 'are holy [*or saints*].' Our translators altered the sense, and put *is sanctified*, instead of *has been sanctified*; because they thought, it seems, the sense required it; but without any such alteration, the paraphrase given by many learned men is to this purpose: — For it has ordinarily come to pass, that an unbelieving husband has been brought to the faith and so to baptism, by his wife; and likewise an unbelieving wife by her husband. If it were not so, and if the wickedness or infidelity of the unbelieving party did usually prevail, the children of such would be generally kept unbaptized, and so be unclean; but now we see, by the grace of God, a contrary effect, for they are generally baptized, and so become holy or sanctified.

If the reader will turn back to ch. 4, and also compare the quotations I shall produce in chap. 15, 18, and 19 of this book, he will see that St. Austin's and Pelagius's comment on those words of the apostle is exactly

* Six Queries. † Modest Plea.

to this purpose; and that Tertullian differs from them only in this, that he expounds the holiness that such children have by the prerogative of their birth, by these words, *sanctitati designati*, 'designed for holiness;' because he reckons and proves from Scripture, that they cannot be actually holy till they are actually baptized; and that St. Hierom and Paulinus speak to the same effect.

The word ἅγιοι, in the New Testament, is translated sometimes *saints*, sometimes *holy persons*; — and was in the same use with them as the word *Christians* is with us.

There are two things, beside what I have mentioned that do make this sense the more natural to that place. One is, that it appears by the apostle's other words in the context, that this was his scope of arguing. *For what knowest thou, O wife*, says he, *whether thou shalt save thy husband? i. e.* by bringing him over to the faith; *or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?* This is a very different aim from what he would have, if he meant only that an unbelieving wife is sanctified to a believer for the use of the bed, as unclean meats are to a faithful eater.

Another is, that the custom of the Jewish language had made it ordinary, before the apostles' time, to use the word *to sanctify* for *baptizing* or *washing*; where God commands Moses, at the giving of the law (Exod. xix. 10) *Sanctify them to-day and to-morrow*; all the learned Jews understand it, that he bid him baptize, *i. e.* wash them; and they prove from this place that Israel entered into covenant by baptism as well as circumcision. Most of the orders to the priests and Levites to sanctify themselves, are explained by washing themselves. Where it is said (Levit. vi. 27) *All that touches the flesh of the sin-offering shall be holy*, the original word is *shall be sanctified*; that is (as the following verses shew) shall be washed. In 2 Sam. xi. 4, it is said *Bathsheba was then purified* (in the original *was sanctified*) *from her uncleanness*; and this was done by washing. The *divers washings* among the Jews, men-

tioned in Heb. ix. 10 (where it is in the original *divers baptisms*) are frequently styled by the Jews in their writings, *sanctifications*; as the priest's washing his hands and feet ten times on the day of Atonement, is called by them *The Ten Sanctifications*. This is so fully cleared by Ainsworth, Lightfoot, Hammond, &c. that there need no more be said of it.

St. Austin, in his *Questions on Leviticus*, has this enquiry, * How it is meant that Moses should *sanctify the high priest* (Levit. xxi. 8) when God says (ver. 15) *I, the Lord, do sanctify him?* In answer to which he distinguishes between the *visible sanctification* and the *invisible*; and, after some discourse that the invisible is the chief, but yet that the other is not to be neglected, says, "Hence Cornelius, and they that were with him, when they appeared to be already sanctified invisibly, by the Holy Ghost coming on them, were for all that baptized; nor was the *visible sanctification* counted needless because the invisible was before."

St. Paul inscribes his epistle sent to the Christians of any place thus: Τοῖς ἁγίοις, 'to the *holy* persons;' or thus, Τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις, 'to such as have been sanctified' at such or such a place; and so the inscription of his letter to the Corinthian Christians in these words (1 Cor. i. 2):—*Unto the church of God, which is at Corinth,* ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις, *to those that are sanctified* [or have been sanctified] *in Christ Jesus, called to be saints:* it is but a larger periphrasis of what one would have said, *To all that are Christians there*; and St. Chrysostom, in his comment on these very words, puts the question, τί δὲ ἐστιν ὁ ἁγιασμός; 'What is the sanctification he speaks of?' — and answers readily, τὸ λουτρὸν, ὁ καθαρισμὸς, 'their laver, 'their baptism, their cleansing.'

The ancient church likewise that compiled the Apostles' Creed, when they would declare it as an article of Christian religion, that all Christians ought to hold com-

* Quest. 84.

munion with one another, express that article thus: 'The communion (τῶν ἁγίων) of saints.'

Therefore, when St. Paul in this place uses the same word; and says, *Else your children would be unclean; but now they are* ἅγια (which word is rendered in English sometimes *saints*, sometimes *holy*) it is not at all alien to his ordinary use of the word to understand it, 'Else your children would be kept unbaptized, unsanctified, unchristian, unholy, or unclean; but now they are generally sanctified by baptism, and become holy, or Christians.' If we had lived in the times of the antients, when the word *sanctified* was used in common speech for *baptized*, this would have seemed a natural interpretation.

This exposition, as it avoids on one side the inconveniency of that given by the Antipædobaptists, which takes the word *holy* and *unclean* in a sense in which they are never used in Scripture, so it is likewise free from the exceptions which lie against that which limits the baptism of children so absolutely to that condition of their being born of believing parents, that it leads the baptizer into many perplexing scruples, whose children he may baptize, and whose not. As the late bishop of Worcester has largely * shewn.

4. What St. Gregory here says in the last place, that he will baptize no Arian, nor any that disown the Godhead of Christ and the Trinity, is according to the general sense of the Catholics of that and of the foregoing times. They would not hold communion with the Arians; and, consequently, would not by baptism enter such as members into their church. The greatest persecution that the Catholics at any time suffered, were on this account; for the Arian Emperors seldom went so far as to force the bishops to renounce the Catholic faith and turn Arians; but they would banish them unless they would receive the Arians to communion, or join with them. It was upon this account that Athanasius (who flourished from the beginning to almost the end of

* Unreasonableness of Separation, part 3, § 36.

the Arian Controversy) did so often suffer exile; because he would not admit Arius or his followers to communion, when it was desired by Constantine [240] (who sought herein the quietness of his own government) and the other emperors that were themselves Arians.

These antients reckoned that Christians might and ought to hold communion, notwithstanding difference of opinions in lesser matters; but that this was a fundamental one, as relating to that which is the direct object of our worship.

The Arians for this reason made a great many attempts to express their faith in such ambiguous terms, as might seem to agree with the Catholic sense. It is a wonder to see in * Socrates and other church historians [259], how many creeds were set forth for this purpose, as schemes of agreement between the two parties. Some of these served in some churches to patch up for a while an unsound union; which was broken to pieces again as soon as each party expressed their meaning in other words; and it was found at last, by a long trial, that there was no firm agreement to be had but by owning the terms of the Nicene Creed. Mr. Le Clerc observes somewhere, that the major part of the councils in those times and of the creeds drawn up in them, were on the Arian side. Nobody need envy them this advantage; for we are not for a number of creeds. The Catholics adhered to the Nicene, and were for having no more than that: it was the Arian party which, not agreeing among themselves, multiplied several draughts of faith. The Nicene Creed was at last found to be the only test to distinguish a Catholic from an Arian.

This I observe on account of some modern Arians, or rather they are to be called *Photinians*; for they have much more dishonourable opinions of our Saviour Christ than the Arians had, and are more in the sentiments of Photinus, who was in the Arian times condemned † both by the Catholics and the Arians.

There are of them both among the Pædobaptists and

* Hist. lib. 2. † Socrat. lib. 2, c. 29.

the Antipædobaptists, whether the Antipædobaptists, that believe in the Trinity, do baptize and receive into communion any such, or not, I am not sure. It is not likely that they who do separate from one another for far lesser differences, will dispense with so great a one about the divinity of Christ.

But those Antitrinitarians, that are Pædobaptists, in England, have of late, on a sudden, declared themselves to be at unity with the Catholic church: yet the account which they give of their conversion to a good opinion of the Catholic faith, is the oddest one that was ever given in so serious a matter. One does not known whether they are in earnest, or whether they mock in speaking of that awful mystery. About the year 1697 they published a paper, which they called *The Agreement between the Unitarians and the Catholic Church*, drawn up by themselves; and whether approved by any other I know not. In a book published next year, which gives an account of *The Life of Thomas Firmin; and of his Religion*, they recite the said *Agreement*, and discourse something more on the subject matter of it. "In the account of his religion," after having observed that people had once thought that the difference between the Unitarians and the Catholic church was "real, great, and even unreconcileable," they add, page 5, —

"But the Unitarians, or Socinians, being men of ingenuous and free minds and principles, and, therefore, always ready to entertain farther light; after eight or nine years late contest in print with the principal divines of this nation, have been so dexterous and happy, that instead of farther embroiling the points in question, which is the usual effect of the paper-war, they seem to have accommodated whatsoever differences were between the church and them;"— and a little after:—

"Other sects, by the favour of princes, or the quality of the times, have obtained an exemption from mulcts, penalties, &c. If Socinianism had anywhere enjoyed those halcyon days, its sudden irresistible progress would have been as lightning, *which rushes out of the east*

and shines even to the west. Alas! on equal ground and with equal circumstances, the combat between unintelligible mystery and clear reason, — between seeming contradictions, absurdities, and impossibilities, and a rational, obvious, accountable faith, would soon have been ended; but it is better ended. The Divine Providence and Goodness, in mercy to both parties, has granted a peace instead of a victory. It has pleased God to favour the suffering side with an unexpected light: he has shewn them (what may seem incredible) that their opposers think as they [the Unitarians] speak, that their difference is not in the ideas or notions, but only in the terms or words. To manifest this, Mr. Firmin caused the following scheme of agreement," &c.

And to this purpose, in the other treatise of the said book, viz. in the *Life of Mr. Firmin*, they say, p. 18, — "The Unitarians never intended to oppose any other Trinity, but a trinity of minds or spirits. Grant to them that God is one infinite spirit or mind, not two or three; they demand no more. They applied themselves, therefore, to enquire which of these Trinities, a Trinity of spirits or of properties, is the doctrine of the Catholic church. They could not miss of a ready satisfaction. All systems, catechisms, books of controversy, councils, writers that have been esteemed Catholic, have defined God to be one infinite, all-perfect Spirit; and the Divine Person to be nothing else but the Divine Essence or Godhead, with the three relative properties, unbegotten, begotten, proceeding."

It is a wonder then that these men could never perceive this before. Had they never looked into any system, catechism, council, &c. before the year 1697? They say themselves, that as soon as they set themselves to enquire, they could not miss of a ready satisfaction.

But since they do now make a proposal of coming into the communion of the church, it is not so material to enquire what was the occasion of their quarrel, as it is to know whether their return to the church be cordial? and, whether they are as yet of such a faith, as that, ac-

cording to this rule of St. Gregory, they ought to be admitted to baptism (those of them that are not yet baptized) or to the communion?

If they would be received as cordially joining with the Catholics, why do they still speak of the divinity of Christ in so ambiguous terms as becomes not such as have lain under censure of false doctrine in that point? they * repeat out of their scheme, "We say our Lord Christ is God and Man. He is Man in respect of his reasonable soul and human body, — God in respect of God in him; or, more scholastically, in respect of the hypostatical or personal union of the humanity of Christ with the divinity. By which the Catholic church means, The divinity was not only occasionally assisting to, but was, and is always in Christ, illuminating, conducting," &c.; — and again, page 50, —

"Nor do we reckon of the Lord Christ as but a Creature: I have said before, he is God and man. The divinity did so inhabit in the humanity of Christ, doth so exert in it the most glorious effects of omnipotence and omniscience, that if others have been called *God* because they *represented* God, Christ is to be so called, because he *exhibits* God."

All this, except what they say of the personal union, is lame still; for another man, as for example Moses, or any prophet that had the Spirit of God in him, illuminating, conducting, and enabling him to work miracles, &c. might be said to *exhibit* God in this sense, — only not in so high a degree, or not always.

What they subscribe to of the hypostatical or personal union would indeed be firm, and for ever stop their way against returning to Socinianism, if they had expressed it scholastically, as they pretend to do. I mean, if they had said this union to be "of the humanity of Christ with the λόγος, or second of the Three Persons;" but when they say, *with the Divinity*, they either do not understand the import of that phrase of

* Account of Firmin's Religion, p. 18.

hypostatical or personal union, or else they purposely confound the notion [160, 244]. They don't mean, sure, that the humanity of Christ is personally united to, or makes One Person with, the Father.

The very doctrine for which both Paulus Samosatenus and Photinus were condemned by the church, was that they made Christ to be God only by the *inhabitation* of God in him; as Bishop Stillingfleet had * fully proved to them; and yet, if you mind these mens' phrases, they own no more; and even the hypostatical union they explain to mean no more, and do, without any modesty, say, that the church means no more by it.

The truth is, the Socinians have very lately made a great and monstrous change in their doctrine, and yet hold their main article still, That Christ has, properly speaking, no nature but the human; and these English Unitarians do, by their way of explaining themselves, give ground to suspect that they are still in that sentiment. They were wont formerly to degrade that λόγος, of which St. John speaks, as much as they could, making it to be nothing but the human nature of Jesus Christ, or something belonging to the human nature. They did use to expound thus: — *In the beginning was the word, i. e.* in the beginning of the gospel, Jesus Christ and his preaching was; *and the word was with God, i. e.* he and his preaching were appointed in the council of God; *and the word was God, i. e.* he was God's deputy to men; *all things were made by him, i. e.* all matters of the gospel dispensation were done by him, &c.

Now, of late they put a notion on the term λόγος, which carries the utmost degree of contrariety to their former interpretation. They make the λόγος to be not at all distinct from God the Father, neither in nature nor in person; but to be his attribute of wisdom, reason, &c. Thus a certain writer over the water, whose works they greedily translate into English: —

* Vindication of Trinity, c. 4.

In the beginning was the word, i. e. in the beginning was reason.

And the word was with God, i. e. and that reason was with God.

And the word was God, i. e. and God was that reason.

The same was in the beginning with God, i. e. there was, I say, reason in God before the world was created. Are not these great apophthegms for St. John to say?

In the following verses, wherever we read *he* or *him*, they translate IT. *All things were made by* it; *and without* it *was not any thing*, &c.; and then (ver. 14) *and the word was made flesh, i. e.* and this reason, by the man in whom it was, was made conspicuous.

Where the author to the Hebrews having expressly named *God's Son, whom he has appointed heir of all things*, adds these words, *by whom also he made the worlds*, because here is no possible turning *him* into *it*, the paraphrase is, "That is, having heretofore by that λόγος, or reason, or eternal wisdom which resided in Jesus, and was most nearly united to him, created all things." If by *most nearly united* be meant so united as to become one person, it is Catholic; but the terms of *residing in him*, and of being *made conspicuous by him*, express a more lax sort of union than what the words of Scripture do everywhere set forth; and at such a rate of interpreting it might be said of any mere man, in whom the Spirit of God does reside, that *the world was made by him*; because he has in him that spirit by which it was made; but the Scripture is far from saying so of any mere man; and of our Lord Jesus Christ it never speaks otherwise than so (Col. i. 16, 17): — *By* him *were all things created*; *and* he *is before all things*; — (Rom. ix. 5) *of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came*, who *is over all*, &c.; — *with the glory* (John xvii. 5) *which I had with thee before the world was*; — *I* (John xvi. 28) *came forth from the Father*; — *before Abraham was, I am* [or was] &c. It is not said, the spirit or wisdom which is in me, came forth from the Father, or had glory with thee; but *I* came forth, — *I*

had glory, &c.; and as far the personal word *I* or *he* can denote the same person, it is here and everywhere else denoted.

The Paulianists and Photinians would say, as these men do, that Christ is God and Man; but if they were asked Whether he was God first, or man first? — they would say, he was man first, and afterwards God, by God's dwelling in him; and these men seem to mean no other; but the Catholic church believes that he was God first, and afterward became man; as St. John tells first what he was originally, and then how he was made flesh.

Cerinthius, who was St. John's chief adversary, and against whom he had a particular eye when he wrote his Gospel (as both * Irenæus and St. Hierom † do witness) taught "that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary in like manner as all other men; and that he was eminent for justice, prudence, and wisdom, above all others; and that, after his baptism, Christ came down upon him from the Supreme Power, in the shape of a dove," &c. This was Cerinthus's doctrine, as ‡ Irenæus repeats it, who lived so nigh those times, that he may well be thought to be born in the time of Cerinthus; and this is the same for substance with the latter of those two sorts of Socinianism that I mentioned, only it was by him blunderingly expressed: that which they style λόγος, he calls *Christ*; and he does not allow him to be born of a virgin. They must be dexterous and happy men indeed, that can reconcile St. John's Gospel to that very sense against which it was purposely written.

This Cerinthus and Ebion, both whose doctrine concerning our Lord was (as Irenæus, in the § next chapter, testifies) the same, were the first Socinians in the world, except those mentioned in John vi. 42, who said, "Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How is it then that he says *I came down from Heaven?*

* Lib. 3, c. 11.
† De Script. Eccl. v. Joannes.
‡ Lib. 1, c. 25.
§ Lib. 1, c. 26.

2. But besides, What hopes can we have of any firm union with these men, who, at the same time that they desire to be received into communion with the Catholic church, do set forth the faith thereof in as ill colours as possibly they can, calling it *unintelligible mystery*, and their own *clear reason*? That which we hold, they describe as *seeming impossibilities, absurdities, and contradictions;* theirs is a *rational, obvious, and accountable faith*; and they express themselves as men that were certain, that if that act of parliament, which they call "a bill in name and pretext against immorality and blasphemy, in truth and real design against the Unitarians," were taken out of the way, we should all presently turn Socinians. — It is to be noted, that this act came out much about the same time that they were *favoured* with that *unexpected light*.

They ought not to be so hasty: there is another book in the way, and that is the Scriptures. If they were abolished, and other records of the church with them, we freely grant that we should not naturally have any notion of a Trinity, of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in one Godhead; nor should we ever have thought of being baptized in such a name; nor have known of the *word which was God, being made flesh*. These mysteries we grant would have been unintelligible.

But then there would have been another inconveniency in that way of knowing God, which they propose, viz. in entertaining only such notions of him as we can form by natural reason and clear ideas; for some few persons, of more refined intellectuals, would conceive him to be a *spiritual Being*, far above the properties and passions of body and matter. Others that could form no notion of a spirit, would say This is *unintelligible mystery*. We must have a God that has a body, or else we shall think him to be nothing. These latter would be subdivided; for some would believe that he is made of a very fine, subtile, and etherial matter, quite different from that which may be seen, or has any limbs, &c. But others, and these the far greatest part of mankind, would contend that a God, that is supposed to

see, and hear, and judge without any ears or eyes, is an absurdity, impossibility, contradiction, a thing of which we can form no clear idea; so they would have a God with eyes and ears as good as any painter could make.

The experience of all ages of the world shews what I say is no fancy but matter of fact. This way, therefore, would not do; except they would join to it the policy of the Papists, who do preserve the true notion of God, as he is set forth in Scripture, for the use of the learned, and such as they allow to read the Scripture, but keep at the same time wooden gods for the use of the mob.

God Almighty give us all the modesty and humility to think that his way of existing may well be such as we cannot comprehend, any more than a worm can comprehend what reason, or speech, or a soul is! and quietly to acquiesce in that account which he has been pleased to give of his own nature, and of what we are to believe concerning him! and to take it according to the plain meaning of those whom he has inspired to write it, and to judge ourselves, as we are, indeed, far incapable of explaining the manner of it! and much more incapable of any ability of trying and examining the truth of it by our natural ideas of the things themselves! This last is impudent in those who do own the divine inspiration of the writers.

The great progress which they boast they should make, has no example for their encouragement in former ages of the church. Cerinthus and Ebion had some followers; but that was before the Canon of Scripture, and particularly St. John's Gospel, was completed and divulged; and it was mostly in wild countries; as* *Arabia Deserta*, &c. After the writings of the apostles were divulged, several single persons,—Artemon [80], Theodotus [160], Paulus of Samosata [245], &c. attempted to set up such a sect, but never proselyted any region or city; and Photinus [275], though a

* Epiphan. in Haer. Ebionitarum

very eloquent man, and setting up in the Arian times, was presently condemned by all parties: so that Epiphanius, who wrote but 30 years after that he began to vent his heresy, and before Photinus himself was dead, as it seems, tells him * "That his heresy, of all others, was the easiest to be confuted, not only by skilful men, but by any that had any tolerable understanding of the sense of Scripture." And a little after, — "The heresy of this impostor is dwindled away, having lasted but a very little while." And Theodoret says, † That in his time it was quite forgot; and so, he says, were all the other heresies that had denied Christ's divinity, — Cerinthians, Ebionites, Sabellians, &c.; so that the very names of those sects were to many unknown. And whereas one ‡ Bonosus, about, or a little after the time of Photinus, went about to vent the same doctrine in Dacia; he was so far from having any number of followers, that he himself or his name is hardly known in history; and Theodoret seems never to have heard of him.

Mahomet the impostor arising in the aforesaid Arabia (of which place § Epiphanius says, It was the chief nest of the Ebionites and Nazaranes, as I have, says he, often already observed) was the only man that after these times ventured to broach the doctrine against Christ's divinity; and he, indeed, with his successors, have converted a great part of the world with a sudden irresistible progress: but then they have accordingly laid aside the name of Christians, and disowned the Scriptures, as being plainly against them in this matter, though they do believe Christ to have been a great prophet.

Since that, in Poland, and such places bordering on the Mahometans, this opinion has been entertained by some few as a middle sort of religion between the Christian and Mahometan: and now of late it is come into

* Hær. 71. † Heret. Fab. lib. 2. c. ult.
‡ Mercator Dissert. contra Anathematismos Nestorij, 522.
§ Hær. 40.

Holland, and from thence into England, serving for the use of such as being staggered in their faith by the arguments of the Deists, which are rife in those countries, yet will not go so far with them as to renounce Jesus Christ and the Scriptures, but take a middle way, holding with the Catholics that he is a true Prophet, and the Messiah promised, and that he died and rose again, and will be our Judge; but, with the Deists, denying his divinity, and holding that he had no being before he was born or conceived in human flesh. They, with the Catholics, say that the Scriptures are (originally and as they came out of the apostles hands) God's word, and not feigned by men; but, with the Deists, that what they say of Christ's Divinity, has been interpolated, or must be explained so as to fit with our natural conceptions; which, they say, cannot admit the notion of a Son of God that is properly one in essence with the Father; nor of such a Son of God taking on him the human nature, when the Father does not. To believe such strange things on the credit of revelation, is, they say, to give great advantage to the Deists, who deny it all.

This opinion, I say, never had any considerable number of followers in the world: the Arian, I grant, had; but that does not nigh so plainly contradict the Scriptures.

Now to return to that which gave the occasion of this digression: The Catholics, as we see here by Gregory Nazianzen, would not baptize or receive to their church an Arian, nor any one that did not profess belief in the Holy Trinity and the Divinity of Christ. The Catholic church is of the same mind still: these men do make an overture, and a declaration of their purpose of joining themselves to the church; and they do many of them put it in practice. If they are truly reconciled to the Catholic faith, nothing were more desirable; but for that there is need of a better test; and it is a question Whether the church ought to receive them without better satisfaction than this scheme of agreement? They own the Apostles Creed indeed,

which our church makes use of in baptism: but by disowning the Nicene, they shew that they do not own the other in the same sense that the church does, but repeat the same words in a very equivocal meaning. When we say, "I believe in Jesus Christ, his only Son," &c. we do by the phrase of believing in him, mean believing in him as in God properly so called; and so we understand likewise the form of baptism in his name, together with the Father and Holy Spirit. And so did the antients: this Gregory,* speaking of the Holy Spirit, and how we are baptized in his name, "If he be a creature (says he) how do we believe in him? For it is one thing to believe in any one, and another to believe something concerning him: for the one is peculiar to God; the other common to any thing." If these men mean quite another thing in both these, I cannot see how we and they have one faith or one baptism; nor indeed how we worship the same God; for the God whom we worship is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

A difference in understanding the meaning of some articles of lesser moment, viz. of Christ's Descent into Hell, is not of the same nature, nor does make an instance for this purpose. If any man differ in opinion from the received tenets of the church in smaller matters, and therefore cannot join in some particular Collect, Office, Prayer, or clause of a Prayer, wherein something relating to those tenets is expressed, we grant what these men plead, that St. Paul's † rule, *If in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you: nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule,* &c. teaches that such a man should continue in communion, and conform to all that he can, and omit the saying *Amen* to that which he judges a mistake. Bishop Stillingfleet has fully ‡ proved this to be the meaning of that place against the Dissenting Ministers, who were not willing that the separation should sink so: and we can well

* Orat. de Sp. Sancto. † Phil. iii. 15, 16.
‡ Unreas. of Separ. P. II.

enough allow of Mr. Le Clerc's explication of Rom. 14. 1, *Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, without examining his doubtful opinions*; and that the church ought to receive such an one. But all this is in differences about such matters as St. Paul there instances, in meats, drinks, or other things not of the foundation. But the doctrine concerning the person of Jesus Christ, and the satisfaction for our sins by him made is, if any thing be, of the foundation.

I think the Church of England has at this time the worst luck in this respect that any church ever had. There are numerous bodies of her people who hold all the same faith with her, that do against her will make schisms from her communion, on occasion of differences in opinion; which are no just ground for separation, which party soever be supposed to be in the right. These she calls and invites to communion in prayers and sacraments, in which they might join even on supposition that they could not part with their particular opinions; and they, either out of peevishness, or else being over-persuaded by their leaders, who find their account in continuing separate bodies whereof they may be heads, do refuse to join even in those things wherein they agree in opinion with us. On the other side, these men who give but a poor account of their agreement with us in fundamentals, declare of their own accord (whether it be to shelter themselves from penalties, or not, I know not) that they will, however, join with us.

The least that can be said is, that it behoves every curate who has good ground to believe concerning any of those that resort to his communion that they are enemies to the doctrine of the Divinity of our Saviour (and there are, up and down, more of them than one would think) to take advice of the bishop how far such are to be admitted to communion.

I mentioned the satisfaction of our Saviour for our sins. It is known how derogatory an explication the Socinians have given of that; they have sometimes so spoke, as if the main or only design of his death were to

give us a good example of suffering patiently; fearing that if too much value were put on his blood as a sufficient ransom for the sins of the world, it must be yielded to be the blood of one that was God in a proper sense as well as man: but whereas the New Testament does almost in every chapter speak of the redemption, propitiation, sacrifice, price, ransom, purchase, paid or wrought by him, and does lay the stress* of our salvation upon our faith in his blood as well as in his doctrine, they do (after having explained away as much of this article as possibly they can) yield that he did satisfy for us a little, or redeem us a little. I have heard one of them in company, and in a braving way, explain it thus: "It is as if a man owed me £1000, and not being able to pay, a friend of his who had some interest in me should intercede with me to forgive him the debt; and, to move me the more, should offer to pay twelve-pence in the pound for him; and I, in condescension to this friend, should accept it for payment in full.

This is to count † the blood of the covenant wherewith we are sanctified a much more mean and ordinary thing than the Scripture does everywhere represent it. And that which brought this passage of a discourse in company to my memory was, the words which these men use, ‡ to shew the soundness of their faith in that matter: "We believe that the Lord Christ by what he did, and what he suffered, was, by the gracious acceptance of God, a true and perfect propitiation for sinners that repent." This is what any Catholic, or any Socinian either, may say, and yet have a very different faith about this article.

The other errors with which they are charged, and do not by that agreement revoke, are great, but not to be named the same day with these.

As for the assemblies which they talk of holding for divine worship distinct from the assemblies of any other denominations of Christians, but these to be not

* Rom. iii. 24, 25. † Heb. x. 29.
‡ Account of Firmin's Religion, p. 19.

by way of schism or separation from the church, but only as fraternities in the church, who should take a more special care of that article (viz. of the Unity of the Godhead) there would be by God's grace no need of them. The Catholic Church does, and ever did, and ever will hold and publish that doctrine in the first place, and above all others. The Athanasian Creed, against which they make their chief exceptions, declares this in words as absolute as any they can desire to be devised; that though the Father be God, Lord, Almighty, &c. and the Son and Holy Spirit likewise, yet there are not three Gods, Lords, Almighties, &c. but one God, one Lord, one Almighty; and would by parity of reason have said, So the Father is Spirit, the Son Spirit, and the Holy Ghost Spirit; and yet not three Spirits but one Spirit.

They confess themselves that all systems, catechisms, and councils have defined this; but they add, especially since the Lateran Council, &c. thereby leaving open a door for that slander of a * friend of theirs to take place, who goes about to make the world believe that anciently, in the times of the Nicene Council, and for some time afterward, the Christians held the faith of the Trinity so as to make three Gods in it.

This slander of an outlandish author our Socinians do greedily embrace and confidently aver; which has, as to most of the particulars by which they would prove it, been fully answered by † Bishop Stillingfleet: and I have occasionally in another place ‡ said something to some of the rest on which they insist, and to that open affront given by the said slanderer to all the churches that use the Nicene Creed, which, he says, they must either expunge out of their Confessions or Liturgies, or else renounce the article of *one God*, pretending that the faith held forth in that creed is Tritheism: but it comes in my way there by the by only.

All that I mention it here for is to shew what an an-

* Mr. Le Clerc. Supplement to Hammond; item Critical Epistles, &c. † Vindication of Trinity, ch. 6. ‡ Part II. ch. v.

tipathy this sort of men have to that creed, and how they accordingly endeavour to blacken it; which is, as I shew in * another place, the most ancient copy of a Christian creed that is now extant in the world, and the most universally subscribed to by all Christians, and has been now for so many ages accounted the only firm test and barrier of the Catholic Church against such as deny the Divinity of our Lord Christ; being of opinion that we can have no sound communion with those that renounce it: and that it is a vain and ill-advised thing to hope in these late ages of the church to pitch or agree on any fitter symbol or test of a Catholic Christian. It should be the more unexceptionable with them, because it has not the words, *Trinity*, *person*, &c. against which their objections chiefly lie: and yet those of them among us that do put in practice the foresaid project of communicating with the church, do, as far as I can understand, generally renounce it; and instead of it, they give here a profession of their faith in words subject to great ambiguity.

The great Bishop Stillingfleet † having occasion to speak of that Canon ‡ of the first Council of Arles, wherein they decree, That if any that come over from a sort of heresy there specified, did offer themselves to communicate with the Catholics, they should be examined by the priests whether they had a right faith of the Trinity, &c. [214]; and if so, they were to be admitted with imposition of hands. But if, being examined, they do not confess this Trinity, then they must be baptized anew. He asks this question, "What Trinity do they mean? of mere names or cyphers, or of one God and two creatures joined in the same form of words as our Unitarians understand it?"

And to the same purpose St. Cyprian [150], arguing that such as had received baptism from some heretics that had monstrous opinions about the Deity ought not to be admitted to communion without a new baptism,

* Part II. ch. ix. † Vindic. of Trinity, c. 9. ‡ Can. 8.

says thus: — * "If by that baptism of theirs the man has obtained remission of sins, then is he sanctified and become a temple of God. Now I ask of what God? If they say, Of God the Creator, that could not be, since he did not believe in him. If of Christ, one that denies Christ to be God cannot be a temple of him. If of the Holy Spirit, whereas these three are one, how can the Holy Spirit be pleased with him who is against either the Father or the Son?"

We may by the by take notice, that it appears by this, and by another plainer † place of St. Cyprian, that *that* text ‡ of St. John, *These Three are One*, either was read then (which was long before the time of Arius) with the same context that it is now, or at least was understood in the same sense.

If these ancient Christians would not admit such men, though recanting their opinions, without a new baptism; I mean, if they had been baptized into any other faith than the true faith of the Trinity, much less would they have entertained communion with them holding still their opinions.

It is St. Gregory's mentioning in this oration of baptism a thing that is so applicable to the case of the church at present, that has drawn me so far from my subject.

CHAPTER XII.

QUOTATIONS OUT OF ST. BASIL.

[Year after the Apostles 260.]

ST. Basil also has an oration or sermon to the catechumens, or new converted Christians, to persuade them to baptism without such delays as many used; but it has not any express mention of the case of infants as to

* Ep. 73. ad Jubianum. † Lib. de Unitate Ecclesiæ.
‡ 1 John v. 7.

baptism; yet it has some things that are cited *pro* and *contra* to that purpose. It may not be amiss to give a short abstract of it, reciting, as I did in the other, the original words of such places only as do by some consequence relate to this question.

Oratio Exhortatoria ad Baptismum.

He begins with observing that Solomon, mentioning a time for every thing, says, *There is a time to be born, and a time to die*, placing the birth first: but that he being to speak of the spiritual birth, must speak of our spiritual death first; which, having done, and shewn the lost condition we are in by nature, and that baptism is the recovery from it, he proceeds: —

Καιροὶ μὲν ὖν ἄλλοις ἐπιτήδειος· ἴδιος ὕπνε, καὶ ἴδιος γρηγορήσεως, ἴδιος πολέμε καὶ ἴδιος εἰρήνης. Καιρὸς δὲ βαπτίσματος ἅπας ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίος.

'There is, therefore, a several season proper for 'several things: a time peculiar for sleep, and one pe-'culiar for watching; a time for war, and a time for 'peace: but any time of one's life is proper for bap-'tism.'

And afterward, "Be it day or night, be it but an hour or a minute, yet the most proper time is Easter; for that is the solemnity of the resurrection; and baptism is to us a ground of our resurrection."

Then having insisted on the advantage of Christ's baptism above that of St. John's, and how all are invited to it, he addresses thus to them: —

Ὀκνεῖς καὶ βελεύη καὶ διαμέλλεις; Ἐκ νηπίε τὸν λόγον κατηχέμενος ἔπω συνέθε τῇ ἀληθείᾳ; Πάντοτε μανθάνων ἐδέπω ἦλθες πρὸς τὴν ἐπέγνωσιν; Πειραστὴς διὰ βίε, κατάσκοπος μέχρι γήρως; Πότη γενήση Χριστιανὸς; Πότε γνωρίσωμέν σε ὡς ἡμέτερον, &c.

'Do you demur, and loiter, and put it off? When 'you have been from a child catechized in the word, 'are you not yet acquainted with the truth? Having

'been always learning it, are you not yet come to the 'knowledge of it? A seeker all your life long! a con- 'siderer till you are old! When will you be made a 'Christian? When shall we see you become one of 'us? Last year you were for staying till this year: 'and now you have a mind to stay till next. Take 'heed, that by promising yourself a longer life, you do 'not quite miss of your hope. You don't know what 'change to-morrow may bring,' &c.

When I first copied out this passage to put it into this collection, I thought it to be the strongest evidence against the general practice of infant baptism in those times, of any that is to be found in all antiquity (though it has not, I think, been taken notice of by any of the Antipædobaptists); for it plainly supposes that a considerable part of St. Basil's auditory at this time were such as had been from their childhood instructed in the Christian religion (and consequently in all probability born of Christian parents) and yet not baptized.

But I have since, in searching after other passages, had occasion more than enough to observe, that there were in these times abundance of people that were well-willers to Christianity; half Christians, who yet put off their absolute owning of it, or being baptized into it for a great many years. These men had, during that their unsettled mind, several children; and they could not, with any face or conscience, desire of the church baptism for these their infant children, unless they would first find in their hearts to accept it for themselves: and so these children came to be taught the doctrine of Christianity, and yet not baptized into it; because their parents, though liking of that religion, yet were not at present fully resolved themselves. But this is no proof that any Christians, after they were once baptized themselves, did ever suffer their infant children to go without baptism.

This place itself is a plain proof that there were a great many such men as I have mentioned; for several of the men to whom St. Basil is here preaching, and

whom he blames for putting off baptism so long, must be thought to have children; which children must be in the case that I speak of: so that this place affords an answer to the objection drawn from itself, or from any other that speaks of children instructed in religion and yet not baptized.

He goes on with his sermon, and shews the advantages of this profession to which he invites them, and the lightness of the yoke which he advises them to put on; and proceeds to speak of the necessity of baptism in these words:—

Ὁ Ἰουδαῖος τὴν περιτομὴν οὐκ ὑπερτίθεται διὰ τὴν ἀπειλὴν, ὅτι πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἥ τις οὐ περιτμηθήσεται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῆς· σὺ δὲ τὴν ἀχειροποίητον περιτομὴν ἀναβάλλῃ ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τῆς σαρκὸς ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι τελουμένῳ; αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἀκούσας, Αμὴν, Αμὴν, &c.

"A Jew does not delay circumcision because of the threatening that every soul that is not circumcised the eighth day shall be cut off from his people: and dost thou put off the circumcision made without hands in the putting off the flesh, which is performed in baptism, when thou hearest our Lord himself say, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except one be born of water and of the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God!* If Israel had not passed through the sea, they had not got rid of Pharaoh: and unless thou pass through the water, thou wilt not be delivered from the cruel tyranny of the Devil, &c.

"If your sins are many, be not frighted because of their number: where sin has abounded, there grace will much more abound, if you will receive it. If they are small and not very heinous, why are you afraid of the time to come, since you have ordered your past life well, even when you were not furnished with the Christian law?

"Look upon your soul to be placed in a balance: the angels draw you one way, the devils the other: to which will you incline? Which shall overcome? carnal pleasure, or holiness of life?

"Do not you remember how in Egypt the destroyer passed over the houses that were marked, when in those that were not so he slew the first-born?

"If a physician could undertake by any art to make you young again when you are old, you would earnestly long for that day in which your florid youth should be restored; and yet now, when it is told you that your soul, defiled with all manner of sin, may be renewed and born again by baptism, you slight so great a benefit!

"Are you young? guard your youth with the bridle of baptism. Is the flower of your age past? do not endanger the loss of your *viaticum;* do not miss of your preservative; do not miss of your eleventh hour as if it were your first.

"I know your reason, though you think to conceal it." 'Stay a little longer (say you) I will make use of the flower of my age in pleasure, &c.; and then, when I have enough of that, I will give it over and be baptized.'

"Think you that God does not see your purpose, or that he will give his grace to so wicked a heart? — If you leave off your sins for old age, thanks to your inability. We regard those that are sober by choice, not by necessity.

"Who has given you a lease of your life? &c. Do not you see children often snatched from the breast, and others die in the flower of their age? &c.

"Do you stay for baptism till some fever force you to it, when you will neither be able to speak the holy words, nor perhaps to hear them, the disease being got into your head?

"The Devil cries, Give me to-day, and give the morrow to God. But God says, *To-day, if you will hear my voice.* The Devil gives us hope of to-morrow, but when to-morrow is come, as a fraudulent divider, he again asks that day for himself, and yields the next to-morrow to God.

"The sanctification of baptism you commend in words; but in your deeds you follow the things that yourself condemn. Take heed you do not repent of

this purpose when it is too late, and will do you no good. Learn wisdom by the example of the foolish virgins, &c.

"Do not you, brother, in like manner put off from year to year, from month to month, from day to day, till a day seize you that you are not aware of, and the opportunity of well-doing fail you, together with your life, &c.

"Then you will lament at your very soul, but nobody will pity you: you will utter dreadful moans, but they will be taken for a delirium. Who will give you baptism at such a time? &c. and perhaps it will be night, and nobody present to help you or baptize you.

"But you say, 'God will then hear me.' Yes, because you hear him now. 'He will grant me some longer time;' Good reason, because you make so good use of what he does grant you. Wretch, do not deceive yourself; let no body seduce you with vain words, sudden destruction will come upon you, and ruin like a storm, &c. The dreadful angel will fetch away your soul, &c.

"What thoughts will you have then? 'Fool that I was! Why did not I put off this heavy load of sin then when I might easily? that I did not wash off these foul stains? &c. Oh! woeful purpose of mine! for the short pleasure of sin to suffer such eternal torments! I might now have been one of those that shine in glory. Oh! just judgment of God! I was called, and would not hear,' &c.

"These and such like complaints you will make then, if you depart hence before you be baptized," &c.

All the rest is such like pathetical exhortation to break off sin, and enter without delay into the Christian covenant: and were very proper to be used to those who now-a-days put off repentance to a death-bed.

St. Basil has also two other * pieces about baptism, written at the desire of some that put questions to him, some concerning baptism, and some on other subjects

* Lib. primus et secundus de Baptismo.

(being probably persons that were preparing themselves to be baptized.) But all the discourse is (as the occasion was) of what is proper for adult persons to know and consider when they come to be baptized, and has nothing that peculiarly concerns infants.

He puts these persons in mind, ὅτι δεῖ πρῶτον μαθητευθῆναι τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ τότε καταξιωθῆναι τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος, 'that they must be first instructed, and then admitted 'to baptism.' These words, taken by themselves, some cite as making against infant baptism; that they must resolve to forsake, not some sins, but all. He shews them the difference of three sorts of baptism, viz. that of Moses, that of John, and that of Christ. The baptism of Moses made a difference of sins; for all sins were not forgiven by it: it required sacrifices to be joined with it; it stood strictly on outward cleansing; it enjoined an unclean person to continue separate for some time; depended upon days and hours, &c. The baptism of John had none of these inconveniences; yet he shews how that also is far surpassed by that of Christ.

Coming to a more particular explication of our Saviour's words (John iii. 3, 5.) of being born again, he says, *I take that word* [ἄνωθεν again] *to signify the rectifying of our former birth, which was in the filth of sin:* as Job says, *no person is clean from sin, though his life be but of one day:* [so they read that * text of Job] and as David laments and says, *I was conceived in iniquity, and in sin did my mother bring me forth.*

There is a passage in a sermon of St. Basil's (that which he preached on a Fast-day, that was kept for the great famine and drought) of which I have not skill enough to judge whether it be a proof of infants baptism then used or not. The judgment of it depends on one's knowing particularly to what part of the public divine service and prayers people were wont to be admitted before they were baptized, and to what not; for St. Basil speaks here of little boys and young children

* Job xiv. 4.

joining in the prayers.' I know that some have written accurately the History of the Catechumens, and in what parts of the Liturgy they did partake. But the passage being short, I can sooner set it down at adventure (that so they that are skilled in that matter may judge whether it be to purpose or not) than I can at present have recourse to those writings.

It is this:—he is telling them that their continuance in their sins hindered their prayers from being heard: but, besides, says he, "What sort of prayer is it that we make? The grown men, all but a few, follow their trades, &c. a very few are left to join with me in the prayers; and those lazy and yawning, and staring about, &c.

Οἱ δὲ παῖδες οἱ σμικρότατοι ὅτοι, οἱ τὰς δέλτας ἐν τοῖς διδασκαλίοις ἀποθέμενοι, καὶ συμβοῶντες ἡμῖν, ὡς ἄνεσιν μᾶλλον καὶ τέρψιν τὸ πρᾶγμα μετέρχονται, &c. ἀνάισθητα δὲ καὶ ἄμεμπτα βρέφη πρὸς τὴν ἐξομολόγησιν ἐπείγεται καὶ ἀθροίζεταί, ὅτε τὴν ἀφορμὴν τῶν λυπούντων, ὅπε τῦ συνήθως προσευξαθαι γνῶσιν ἢ δύναμιν ἔχοντα. Σὺ μοὶ πάρελθε εἰς μέσον, &c.

'And these little boys that have left their books at school, and do make the responses together [*or sing together*] with us, do it as a piece of pleasure, and the work of a play-day, &c. And the infants that have no sense, nor any guilt, they also are brought thick and in crowds to the public confession, who neither understand the occasion of the grief, nor are capable of praying accordingly. Come yourselves to the office, you that have the load of sins upon you: it is you that ought to prostrate yourselves to mourn and weep,' &c. Οὔδει δὲ παρεῖναι κακεῖνο, μετὰ σῦ πάντως, ὁ μόνον. 'They [*the infants*] ought to be present indeed; but to come along with you, and not alone by themselves.'

If the catechumens did not use to be admitted before their baptism to those parts of the office that consisted in psalmody and making the responses, then it is a sign that these little boys had been baptized: but if they did, it is only my labour lost in reciting it here. P. S. I am

since certified by a very learned man, that these children must have been baptized.

But a more material evidence than any that can be found in St. Basil's writings is taken from his practice; of which there is an authentic record given by Theodoret and other historians that lived but a little after St. Basil [320], in reference to the baptizing of a child of Valens the emperor. This emperor being an Arian, and having been prevailed on by the Arians to take an * oath that he would always maintain that faith, and persecute the contrary, viz. that of the Catholics, did accordingly, and raised great persecution against all the Catholic bishops in his dominion, and particularly against St. Basil, who was bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; but having great afflictions in his family at the same time, which looked like judgments, and, among the rest, his only child sick and at the point of death, he was wrought on partly by the guilt of his conscience, and partly by his wife's entreaty, to abate of the rigour which he was then using against St. Basil, who was by all looked on as a pious and good man: and he also sent for him to come and pray for his child. And then, as † Theodoret proceeds to relate the matter;—

Ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος καταλαβὼν τὰ βασίλεια, καὶ τὸν τοῦ βασιλέως υἱὸν παρ' ἀντὴν ὄντα τὴν τελευτὴν θεασάμενος, πρὸς τὴν ζωὴν τοῦτον ὑποστρέφειν ὑπέσχετο, εἰ τοῦ παναγίου βαπτίσματος διὰ τῶν εὐσεβούντων ἀξιωθείη· καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἐξεληλύθεν. Ὁ δὲ τὸν ὅρκον κατὰ τὸν ἀνόητον μεμνημένος Ἡρώδην, τοῖς συμπαροῦσιν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς σομμορίας Ἀρείου βαπτίσαι τὸ παιδίον προσέταξεν.

'The great Basil coming into the palace, and seeing 'the emperor's son at the point of death, undertook 'that he would recover if he had baptism given him by 'the hands of the godly [*meaning the Catholics*]; and 'having said this he went away. But he [*the emperor*] 'remembering, like foolish Herod, his oath, gave order

* Theodor. Hist. Eccl. lib. 4. c. 12. † Hist. Eccl. lib. 4. c. 17.

'to some that were present of the faction of Arius, to 'baptize the child,' &c.

The issue was, the child died, and Valens for the present repented both of his oath and cruelty, and went to St. Basil's church, and made his oblations; but afterward he revolted to his former temper.

All that is doubtful in this passage is, whether this child was so young as that his baptism deserves to be called Infant Baptism; or whether he were of such age as to be capable to be baptized on his own profession. Theodoret, we see, calls him παιδίον, which properly signifies *a little child*, or *infant*; and is the same word that is used Mark x. 13, προσέφερον παιδία, *They brought young children*; and Matt. ii. 11, εὗρον τὸ παιδίον, *They found the young child wrapped in swaddling clothes*. Gregory Nazianzen * says, that he was there present with St. Basil at that time: and he compares the emperor's afflicting himself for his child to David's for his in the like case, but mentions not the age. Socrates † calls him νήπιον υἱὸν τοῦ Οὐάλεντος, 'the infant 'son of Valens.'

But there is among the works of Ephræm Syrus, published in Latin, a sermon on St. Basil, in which he mentions this story, but speaks so of the child, as if he had some understanding of religion; for he makes Basil covenant with Valens: "If you will so deliver him to me, that I may bring him to the true faith, and free him from the impiety of the Arian doctrine," &c. And again, "They [*the Arians*] baptized him with water, but not with the Spirit, for they taught him to reject the Son of God," &c. But the works of this father which we have are of such doubtful credit (they must first have been translated out of Syriac, for he understood no other language, and they abound with very frivolous stories) that a quotation out of them cannot come in competition with the received historians.

---

* Orat. in Basilium. † Hist. lib. 4. c. 26.

Valesius * has gone about to find out by chronological characters the age of this child when he died: not in any enquiry about infant baptism, but to set some passages right in chronology. He makes him to be six years old; the proofs of it are something forced, and are too nice and far from our purpose to be repeated here. He judges that it was he that was consul *anno Dom.* 369, with Victor (though the name there be Valentinian, and the historians call this child's name Galates) and that Socrates mistook Valentinian the Younger for this child; and that it was on him that Themistius made that consular oration (for the flattery of that time was to make emperor's infant children consuls, and speak orations to them) where he says "Even while you are carried in people's arms, you make war together with your father."

But suppose it were so, he must yet be baptized with the form of infant baptism; for a child of six years old is capable of no other: and if he was so old as six years, he must be born before his father was baptized into the Christian religion himself; for by this account this child was born to Valens before the victory over Procopius the usurper; and so Valesius owns. Now that victory was before the beginning of Valens his war against the Goths; and it was in that war that he being minded to go to battle in person†, thought not fit to go unprovided of the divine grace, but to guard himself with the armour of baptism. And if the child was born before his father was baptized, that might be the reason that he was not baptized quickly after his birth.

---

* Annot. in Socrat. lib. 4. c. 10. it. 26.

† Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. lib. 4. c. 11, 12.

CHAPTER XIII.

QUOTATIONS OUT OF ST. AMBROSE.

[Year after the Apostles 274].

Ambrosius Comment. lib. 1, *in St. Lucæ, c.* 1.

He is there commenting on those words (Luke i. 17) where the angel prophesies of John the Baptist, *He shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias;* and after having shewn, in several particulars, how John in his office did resemble Elias, and having mentioned that miracle of Elias, of dividing the river Jordan, he adds these words, —

"Sed fortasse hoc supra nos et supra apostolos videatur expletum. Nam ille sub Elia diviso amne fluvialium recursus undarum in originem fluminis (sicut dicit Scriptura, Jordanes conversus est retrorsum) significavit salutaris lavacri futura mysteria, per quæ in primordia naturæ suæ qui baptizati fuerint parvuli a malitia reformantur."

'But, perhaps, this may seem to be fulfilled in our 'time and in the apostle's time; for that returning of 'the river waters backward toward the spring-head, 'which was caused by Elias when the river was di-'vided (as the Scripture says *Jordan was driven back)* 'signified the sacrament of the laver of salvation, which 'was afterward to be instituted; by which those in-'fants that are baptized; are reformed back again from 'wickedness [*or a wicked state*] to the primitive state of 'their nature.'

He means, they are freed from the guilt of original sin, and in some sense reduced back to the primitive state in which man was before that happened. He plainly speaks here of infants as baptized *in the apostle's time*, as well as in his own; and makes St. John (if his meaning be to speak of the persons baptized by him) in

baptizing infants for the reformation of their nature back again to the primitive purity of it, to resemble Elias, in turning back the waters to their spring-head.

This passage of St. Ambrose is quoted by St. Austin, lib. 1, *contra* Julian. c. 2.

I said, in the former editions, that St. Ambrose does here say in effect, that John Baptist did baptize infants. My reason was, Because he had before, in the parallel between John and Elias, observed that as Elias was in the desart, — so was John; as Elias was fed by ravens, — so John lived upon coarse food; — as Elias boldly rebuked Ahab, — so John did Herod; and (among other comparisons) *Ille Jordanem divisit, hic ad lavacrum salutare convertit:* —'As Elias separated [*or, drove back*] 'the waters of Jordan, — so John brought persons to 'the baptism of salvation;' which, joined with what he says here, that the new formation of *infants* in baptism back to their primitive purity, was typified by Jordan, turned back towards the spring-head, does, I think, lead to such an interpretation of his words; but, however (leaving that deduction of the chain of thought to the judgment of the reader) he does plainly speak of the baptism of infants used in the apostles time; which is more to the purpose.

Ambrosius, lib. 2; de Abraham Patriarcha, lib. 2, c. 11.

He is here speaking of that part of the history of Abraham where he is commanded to be circumcised, and to circuncise his infants, and of the severity of the penalty on an infant that is not circumcised; and has these words in relation to circumcision: "For a very good reason does the law command the males to be circumcised in the beginning of infancy, even the bond-slave born in the house; because as circumcision is from infancy, so is the disease. No time ought to be void of the remedy, because none is void of guilt," &c.; and a little after, "Neither a proselyte that is old, nor an infant born in the house, is excepted; because every age is obnoxious to sin, and, therefore,

every age is proper for the sacrament." He also applies this to spiritual circumcision and baptism; and says, "The meaning of the mystery is plain. Those born in the house are the Jews; those bought with money are the Gentiles that believed; for the church is bought with the price of Christ's blood; therefore, both Jew and Gentile, and all that believe, must learn to circumcise themselves from sin, that they may be saved. Both the home-born and the foreigner, the just and the sinful, must be circumcised by the forgiveness of sins, so as not to practise sin any more; for no person comes to the kingdom of Heaven but by the sacrament of baptism;"—and at the end of that paragraph cites these words of our Saviour, giving his note on them:—

"Nisi enim quis renatus fuerit ex Aqua et Spiritu Sancto, non potest introire in regnum Dei. Utique nullum excipit; non infantem, non aliqua præventum necessitate. Habeant tamen illam opertam pænarum immunitatem, nescio an habeant regni honorem."

'*For unless any person be born again of water, and of the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* You see he excepts no person, not an infant, not one that is hindered by any unavoidable accident; but suppose that such have that freedom from punishment, which is not clear, yet I question whether they shall have the honour of the kingdom.'

This, as to the need of baptizing infants, is plain; but I know not what to make of the word *opertam* in this sentence, unless it be to be rendered as I have rendered it, *which is not clear*, or *of which we have no certain knowledge*.

Many writers of the Greek Church do speak of a certain middle state in the life to come, in which infants that die unbaptized, and also other persons that miss of baptism, not by their own fault, but by some accidental hindrance, shall be placed; which place or state, shall not, as they think, partake, or not much partake, either of happiness or torment. Gregory Nazianzen's words

to that purpose are in the (ch. 11.) passages I cited of his, and I shall have occasion hereafter (part 2, ch. 6.) to mention more; but this opinion of a middle state seems not to have taken any footing in the Latin Church at this time, tho' it be since embraced by the Papists, under the name of *Limbus Puerorum.*

St. Ambrose, who was conversant in the Greek writers, and, as St. Hierom * observes, borrowed much out of their works, had met with it there; and here mentions it, but calls it *opertam*, a thing not certainly revealed or known, but *hidden* and uncertain. His meaning is, that since our Saviour's sentence of the necessity of baptism for entering the kingdom of God is general, and does not except infants, it is very questionable, whether an infant, unbaptized, can have the said kingdom; and as for the middle state between Heaven and Hell, which some do suppose, it is to us a thing hidden or unknown whether there be any such state. One may observe, in this passage, a thing which I have observed in many sayings of the antients, that among the several names which they give to baptism, they often, by this phrase, *the forgiveness of sins*, do mean the sacrament of baptism. The coherence of the sentence shews it here. "They must be circumcised by *the forgiveness of sins*, for no person can come to the kingdom of Heaven but by the sacrament of baptism;" and so it does in a passage of the epistle of Barnabas which I produce, part 2, ch. ix.

St. Austin, a little after these times, does earnestly labour to shew that there is no such state, though he had once so spoken as if he thought there might. I shall have occasion to produce his sayings on † one side and the ‡ other. He is the more earnest at this latter place against the middle state, because Pelagius had served himself of this notion to evade the argument which is taken from the need that infants have of baptism, to prove that they have original sin; for Pelagius said, they have no sin; and if they die unbaptized, they will not be punished, but be in that middle state.

* Præfat. in lib. Didymi. † Ch. 15. ‡ Ch. 19.

The quotations out of the book *de Vocatione Gentium* and *Epist. ad Demetriadem*, I have not, as many do, set down to St. Ambrose, because they are not his, but Prosper's, or Pope Leo's, who yet lived both of them but a little after our period [340, 344]. Every body has read how largely Prosper there disputes against those that would maintain that all the grace of God depends upon our use of free-will, shewing, that they that use that method of explaining the events that happen, can never solve that difficulty, "How it comes to pass that so great a multitude of infants dying unbaptized [or, as he styles it *unregenerated*] do perish." On which argument he has a whole chapter, pretending to shew that all must be attributed to God's free giving or refusing his grace.

CHAPTER XIV.

QUOTATIONS OUT OF ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM.

[Year after the Apostles 280.]

St. Chrysostom has had more of his works published than any of the foregoing; because every thing that he preached or dictated was thought fit to be published,—not that he had any greater skill in divinity than ordinary, but because of his golden tongue, from which he had this name, and which made the people that used to hear him say, "They had rather the sun should not shine, than that John should not preach;" but of the multitude that were published a great many are lost; and to make up the defect, a great many spurious ones have been set out under his name. The industry and skill of the latter ages, and particularly of Sir Henry Savile, has, in a good degree, fanned and distinguished the one from the other; therefore, I shall omit the quotations about this subject that are found in those books which are either plainly spurious, or suspected, though they are probably very ancient, and of men that lived at or about the same time.

Of the first sort is the Homily concerning Adam and Eve, in which is a passage mentioning infant baptism; but it is plainly the work of some later author; of the second, is the Homily on Psalm xiv, in which is a passage of the same subject, which is quoted in this controversy by many learned men, — Cassander, &c. and even by * Bishop Stillingfleet.

As for the passages in his genuine works, he has not many on this subject; for orators love only such subjects as may be adorned with flowers of rhetoric, of which so plain a thing as the baptizing of infants is not so capable; and for those which he has, I am not very confident that I have all that are in so many voluminous books; but those which I shall produce do plainly shew his sense, and the practice of the churches where he lived, which were Antioch and Constantinople.

Hom. 40, in Genesin, edit. Saville, tom. I.

He had been speaking of circumcision, and observes, how much more favourable and bountiful God is to the Christians in the baptism which he has appointed to them in lieu thereof, and says, "There was pain and trouble in the practice of that, and no other advantage accruing from the circumcision, than this only, That, by this sign, they were known and distinguished from other nations, ἡ δὲ ἡμετέρα περιτομὴ, ἡ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, λέγω, χάρις ἀνώδυνον ἔχει τὴν ἰατρείαν καὶ μυρίων ἀγαθῶν προξενος γίνεται ἡμῖν, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἡμᾶς ἐμπίπλησι χάριτος. Καὶ γὲ ὡρισμένον ἔχει καιρὸν καθάπερ ἐκεῖ, ἀλλ' ἔξεστι καὶ ἐν ἀωρῳ ἡλικία καὶ ἐν μέσῃ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ γήρα γενόμενήν τινα ταύτην δέξαςθαι τὴν ἀχειροποίητον περιτομὴν· ἐν ᾗ οὐκ ἔστι πόνον ὑπομεῖναι, ἀλλ' ἁμαρτημάτων φορτία ἀποθέσθαι καὶ τῶν ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ πλημμελημάτων συγχώρησιν εὑρέσθαι.

'But our circumcision, I mean the grace of baptism, gives cure without pain, and procures to us a thousand benefits, and fills us with the grace of the

* Unreasonableness of Separation, Part 3, ch. 36.

'Spirit; and it has no determinate time as that had; 'but one that is in the very beginning of his age, or 'one that is in the middle of it, or one that is in his 'old age, may receive this circumcision made without 'hands; — in which there is no trouble to be under-'gone, but to throw off the load of sins, and receive 'pardon for all foregoing offences.'

That ἄωρος ἡλικία signifies here, as I have rendered it, *the beginning of age*, or infancy, appears both by the sense, and also by his use of the same word in the * Homily before, where, giving the reason why circumcision was appointed the eighth day, he makes this to be one: —

1. Because the cutting of the flesh is more easily borne (ἐν ἀώρῳ ἡλικίᾳ) *in the beginning of the age*, or infancy.

2. And his other reason is, "That they might understand by the thing itself that it signified nothing to the soul, but was given for a mark of distinction;" and then he there again uses the same word, τὸ γὰρ ἄωρον παιδίον τὸ μὴ γινῶσκον τὰ γινόμενα, μηδὲ αἴθησίν τινα ἔχον, &c. 'For 'a new-born child, that knows not what is done to 'him, nor has any sense, what profit for his soul can 'he receive thereby?' &c. The word ἄωρος, which, in some authors, signifies *unseasonable*, or *out of time*, signifies with him *newly-begun*, or *that has had no time pass over it*.

It is a very singular notion in the divinity of this father, to say that circumcision had no spiritual import, but was only a badge of national distinction. The Scripture, and the fathers too, generally speak of it as *the seal* (Rom. iv. 11) *of the righteousness of the faith that Abraham had*, and the (Acts vii. 11) covenant, or *seal of the covenant* that God made with him and his seed; and that contains something more than that they should be known from other nations. It was that *he* (Gen. xvi. 7.) *would be their God, and they his people.*

* Hom. xxxix. in Genesin.

Also, to argue that circumcision could signify nothing to the soul, because it was given (ἐν ἀώρῳ ἡλικίᾳ) *in infancy* at the same place where one is to shew that baptism (which as he himself grants, may also be given, ἐν ἀώρῳ ἡλικίᾳ, *in infancy*) does convey so many spiritual benefits, betrays some inadvertency or forgetfulness of what he had said before.

It is more to our present purpose to observe the other difference that he makes. "Circumcision was to be given on the eighth day; but baptism has no determinate time, but it is lawful that one in infancy, or one in middle age, or one in old age, do receive it." Was it not the same in circumcision? If circumcision had been omitted in infancy, or if it were a Heathen who came over to the Jewish religion in middle age, or old age, circumcision was given then, rather than not at all; or is his meaning this, That a Jew was obliged to circumcise his child in infancy; but a Christian parent may baptize his child in infancy, if he please? — or he may, if he please, let it alone to be done at middle or at old age? His words, as they stand here, might be capable of such a sense; but this is not reconcileable with what he says in other places of the necessity of baptism, and the danger in case a person die without it, which would often happen to children, if it were so deferred. He often speaks to this purpose, as Hom. 1, *de Pœnitentia*, Πρὸς δὲ βαπτίσματος ἐκ ἐστὶ πατρῴαν λαβεῖν ἢ δέξασθαι κληρονομίαν. And again, Οὐ δεῖς δὲ υἱὸς βαπτίσματος ἂν κληθείη χωρίς. 'There is no receiving or having the bequeathed 'inheritance before one is baptized; and none can be 'called a Son till he is baptized;' and I have occasion to quote more of his to this purpose at (part 2, ch. 6) another place. St. Austin quotes a saying of his to this purpose * in his disputes with Julian (if he do not mistake an oration of St. Basil's for one of St. Chrysostom's, for the words are the same which I recited of St. Basil): St. Austin is there proving that Chrysostom, as

* Lib. 2, contra Julianum, c. 9.

well as the other Catholic doctors, owned original sin; which Julian denied, though he owned infant baptism.

"The same holy John, even he as well as the martyr Cyprian, teaches that the circumcision of the flesh was commanded in way of a type of baptism." Then he recites these words, as from Chrysostom, "A Jew does not delay circumcision because of the threatening, &c. and dost thou delay the circumcision made without hands?" &c. as they stand recited (ch. 12) above. Then St. Austin adds, "You see how this man, established in the ecclesiastical doctrine, compares circumcision to circumcision, and threat to threat; that which is *not to be circumcised on the eighth day*, — That it is *not to be baptized in Christ;* and what it is *to be cut off from his people*, — That it is *not to enter into the kingdom of Heaven;* and yet you [Pelagians] say that, in the baptism of infants, there is no putting off the flesh, *i. e.* no circumcision made without hands, when you affirm that they have nothing which needs to be put off; for you do not confess them to be *dead in the* (Col. ii. 13) *uncircumcision of the flesh*, by which is meant *sin*, especially that sin which is derived originally; for by reason of this, our body is the *body* (Rom. vi. 6.) *of sin*, which the apostle says *is destroyed by the cross of Christ*."

There is another passage in a homily of St. Chrysostom *ad Baptizatos*, which is not now extant in Greek; but is cited by Julian in Latin, and by St. Austin in Greek, which is full to this purpose of infant baptism. The citations are in St. Austin, lib. 1. *contra* Julianum, where Julian says thus: —

"Holy John, Bishop of Constantinople, denies that there is any original sin in infants; for in that Homily which he preached concerning baptized persons, he says, 'Blessed be God, who only does wonders, who has created and ordered all things! Lo, they do enjoy the serenity of freedom, who but even now were held in captivity; they are become citizens of the church, who were in the vagabond state of aliens; and they are entered into the lot of the righteous, who were under the

confusion of sin; — for they are not only free, but saints; nor saints only, but justified; and not only justified, but sons; and not only sons, but heirs; not heirs only, but brothers of Christ; not only his brethren, but coheirs; not coheirs only, but members of him; not members only, but his temple; and not his temple only, but organs of his Spirit. You see how many are the benefits of baptism! — and yet some think that the heavenly grace consists only in forgiveness of sins; but I have reckoned up ten advantages of it; *for this cause we baptize infants also, though they are not defiled with sin*, — that there may be superadded to them saintship, righteousness, adoption, inheritance, a brotherhood with Christ, and to be made members of him.'

This sentence Julian brought to shew that Chrysostom's sense was, That infants are baptized not for forgiveness of sins, from which they are free; but only that they might have a right to Christ's kingdom; which was exactly what Julian and his party, who denied original sin, would have.

And, indeed, it was a shrewd place; and St. Austin has much ado to reconcile it to any good and catholic sense: he uses three ways to do it: —

1. He shews how improbable it was that John, living in the Catholic church, and being a renowned bishop in it, should really hold a doctrine so contrary to that which he had shewn by instances to be the general sense of all Catholic doctors.

2. He produces other passages out of his writings, which do plainly own the orthodox doctrine of the guilt of original sin, — however incongruously he may seem to speak in this place.

3. As to the place itself, he shews that Julian had not translated the words exactly true, but had given the expression a turn to his own advantage; for whereas the words are in the Greek, *though they have not any sins*, Julian had made use of a faulty Latin translation, in which some copies read *not defiled with sins;* others *with sin*, in the singular number; of which last copy St.

Austin says, "I doubt some of your party have chosen to express it in the singular number, that it might be taken for that *one sin*, of which the apostle speaks (Rom. v. 16): — *Judgment came by one* [sin] *to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.* You chose to word it, *not defiled with sin*, that *that* one sin of the first man might come into the reader's mind. But not to go by suspicions, and supposing this to be the mistake of the scribe, or the variety of the interpreter, I will set down the Greek words themselves which John spoke, Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὰ παιδία βαπτίζομεν καίτοι ἁμαρτήματα μὴ ἔχοντα; which is, *For this reason we baptize infants also, though they have not any sins.* You see, he did not say that infants are not defiled with sin or sins; but that they have not any sins. Understand it *of their own*, and there is no dispute. But you will say, Why did he not say *of their own?* Why do you think, but for this reason, because he, discoursing in the Catholic church, supposed that he could be understood in no other sense; — nobody was puzzled about that matter. You [Pelagians] not having then raised any controversy, he spoke with less caution."

Perhaps, there might have been added to St. Austin's answer this, That the Greek writers though, they own this natural corruption, yet do not generally, by the property of their language, call it by the name of *Sin;* but they express by the name of *Natural Defilement, Pollution, Disease*, and the like, that which the Latins call *Original Sin.* The word ἁμαρτία, and especially ἁμάρτημα, do properly with them signify an *actual sin* or transgression; — so Theodoret, who lived a little after these times [320], and consequently ought to speak with more caution, and was no favourer of Pelagianism (for that was a time when Pelagius and his opinions having been lately condemned by canons and edicts in all parts of the world, it was no time for a bishop of the Catholic church to own them) yet speaks thus: — * "Baptism is not (as the silly Messalians say)

* Hæretic. Fabular, lib. 5, c. de Baptismo.

a razor, only to cut off sins that are past, which it does over and above; for if it had no other effect but that, what need we baptize infants, that have not tasted of sin? The sacrament promises not this only, but greater and higher things; for it is a pledge of future blessings, a type of the resurrection, a communication of Christ's passion," &c.

This is made more plain by the phrase used by Isidorus Pelusiota [312], who, as well as Theodoret, was a disciple of St. Chrysostom, and both of them followers of his doctrine, and imitators, as far as they could, of his expression; for he, at the same place, speaks of infants as not having any sin, and yet being defiled with the corruption caused by Adam's transgression. His words are,

* "Whereas your Excellency wrote to me, desiring to know for what reason, Βρέφη ἀναμάρτητα ὄντα Βαπτίζεται, infants, that have no sin, are baptized? I have thought it needful to give you my answer. Some that speak below the dignity of the subject, say it is, That they may wash off that pollution (ῥύπον) which is transmitted on human nature by the transgression of Adam. I also do believe that *that* is done; but not that only (for that were not so great a matter) but that a great many other graces, far transcending our nature, are thereby given;"—and so he goes on to reckon up redemption, regeneration, adoption, &c. much to the same purpose as St. Chrysostom does.

This shews that, in their way of speaking, infants (though acknowledged to have a pollution of nature from Adam, which needed washing off) yet were said not to have (ἁμαρτίας or ἁμαρτήματα) sins; and even those commendations of baptism, and the effects of it in infants, that it is redemption, regeneration, &c. do suppose an evil state from which they are redeemed, regenerated, &c.; which state is the same that the Latins call *Original Sin*.

* Lib. 3, epist. 195, ad Herminum Comitem.

But be that how it will, St. Chrysostom speaks plainly of the *practice* of infant baptism; and our present inquiry is to know the practice of the churches, and not whether he had a right apprehension of all the grounds of it? If any in these times used it, and did not well apprehend the grounds of it, it is the greater sign that they were satisfied that it had ever been done.

Chrysost. Hom. 23, in Acta Apost.

He is there bemoaning that evil inclination, and that aversion to a godly life, that is universally found in men, — which keeps from receiving of baptism those that are not yet baptized, and perverts from a godly course of life even those that have received it; and on that head says thus: —

Οἱ μὲν ἐν κατηχούμενοι τοῦτο σπουδάζοντες ἀδιαφόρων ποιοῦνται ἐπιμέλειαν ὀρθοῦ βίου. Οἱ δὲ ἤδη βαπτισθέντες, οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ παιδες ὄντες τοῦτο ἔλαβον, οἱ δὲ ἐν ἀῤῥωστίᾳ καὶ ἀνενεγκόντες ἐπειδὴ μὴ εἶχον προθυμίαν τινὰ ζῆσαι δι' Θεὸν, οὐδὲ ἵνα σπουδὴν εἰδεῖεν· Οἱ δὲ ἐν ὑγείᾳ λαβόντες, ὀλίγην ταύτην καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐνδείκνυνται, καὶ πρὸς τὸ παρὸν διατεθέντες θερμοὶ, μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ ὅτοι τὸ πῦρ ἐβεσεν.

'The catechumens being of this mind [*i. e.* having this aversion] take no care of a godly life; and those that are baptized, some of them forasmuch as they were children when they received it, and some for that they received it in a fit of sickness, having put it off to that time, and having no mind to live godly, shew no good inclination; and they that received it in their health shew but very little, having been for the present zealously affected; afterward, even they let this fire of zeal go out.'

Here it plainly appears that part of the people he speaks to (viz. those that had been born of Christian baptized parents) had been baptized in infancy; and part of them (viz. those that had turned Christians in their adult age) had been baptized since; and some of the last sort were not yet baptized.

Another passage of St. Chrysostom does not mention baptism by name; but yet it plainly refers to the custom of making, on the infant's forehead, the sign of the Cross, at his baptism. It is this: —

Hom. 12, *in* 1 *Epist. ad Corinthos.* *

He is there blaming the women for several superstitious and heathenish rites, which they practised upon their new-born infants: one was, a custom that they had of rubbing the forehead of the child with a sort of dirt, prepared with some magical tricks, which was to preserve it from being bewitched. He tells them that such a practice, instead of guarding and purifying the infant, makes it abominable. The words are,

Ὁ βορβόρῳ χρίων πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ βδελυκτὸν ποιεῖ τὸ παιδίον; Πῶς γὰρ αὐτὸ προσάγει παῖς χερσὶ τῷ ἱερέως; Εἰπέ μοι, πῶς ἀξιοῖς ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου σφραγῖδα ἐπιτεθῆναι παρὰ τῆς τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου χειρὸς ἔνθα τὸν βόρβορον ἐπέχρισας.

'He that anoints an infant so with that dirt, How 'can he think but that he makes it abominable? How 'can he bring it to the hands of the priest? Tell me, 'How can you think it fitting for the minister to make 'the sign on its forehead, where you have besmeared it 'with the dirt?'

CHAPTER XV.

QUOTATIONS OUT OF ST. HIEROM AND ST. AUSTIN, BEFORE THE RISE OF THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.

[Year after the Apostles from 278 to 310.]

Out of St. Hierom's Letter to Leta.

THERE was never nigh so much occasion given to mention the baptism of infants in books and writings before

* Propè finem.

Pelagius vented his heresy against the doctrine of original sin, as there was after that heresy was started; for as the disputes about that matter filled all the world, so the arguments which the Catholics drew from the baptism of infants for original sin, and the Pelagians answer to them, made a considerable part of those disputes.

These two fathers lived to see, and to bear a great part in the said disputes; but they had each of them wrote several books before that controversy began. The quotations out of their tracts against the Pelagians will be best understood if put in a chapter by themselves, together with some others out of Pelagius himself and other managers of the same party, and ranked according to the order of time in which they were written; for they were mostly written by way of impleading and answering one another. I have, therefore, in this chapter selected some passages out of such writings of theirs as were before the said controversy, or did not at all relate to it, that the mixing of them may not disturb the order of the other.

Hieronymus Epist. ad Letam de Institutione Filiæ, Epist. 7.

He is there admonishing that lady of the charge that lay on her conscience to take care of the education of her child; and that God does require of parents an account of the child's miscarriage, if it happened by their fault; and says, "Eli, the priest, brought on himself the anger of God for the faults of his children. He must not be a bishop that has children riotous or unruly. On the other side it is (1 Tim. ii. 15) written of a woman, that *she shall be saved in* [or by] the procreating of children *if they shall continue in faith, and charity, and holiness* with modesty. If their adult age when they are at their own dispose, be imputed to their parents, how much more the time of their infancy and tender years, which, as the Scripture says, *is not able to distinguish the right hand from the left,* — *i. e.* knows

not the difference of good and evil?" Then follows this objection:—

"Et quomodo, inquies, peccata parentum filiis non redduntur, nec filiorum parentibus, sed anima quæ peccaverit ipsa morietur?

"Hoc de his dicitur qui possunt sapere, de quibus in evangelio Scriptum est, ætatem habet, loquatur pro se. Qui autem parvulus est et sapit ut parvulus, donec ad annos sapientiæ veniat, et Pythagoræ litera Y eum perducat ad bivium, tam bona ejus quam mala parentibus imputantur. Nisi forte existimas Christianorum filios, si baptisma non receperint ipsos tantum reos esse peccati, et non etiam scelus referri ad eos qui dare noluerint; maxime eo tempore quo contradicere non poterant qui accepturi erant. Sicut e regione [alias, sic in regione vitæ] salus infantium majorum lucrum est."

'And how then is it true, you will say, that the sins of 'the fathers are not imputed to the children, nor those 'of the children to the fathers, but the soul that sinneth, 'it shall die?

'This is said of those that have understanding, of 'such as he was of whom it is written in the gospel, '*He is of age, let him speak for himself*; but he that 'is a child, and thinks as a child (till such time as he 'comes to years of discretion, and Pythagoras's letter *Y* 'do bring him to the place where the road parts into two) 'his good deeds, as well as his evil deeds, are imputed 'to his parents. Unless you will think that the children of Christians are themselves only under the guilt 'of the sin, if they do not receive baptism; and that 'the wickedness is not imputed to those also who would 'not give it them, especially at that time when they 'that were to receive it could make no opposition 'against the receiving it. As also, on the other side, '[or as also in the kingdom of Life] the salvation of infants is the advantage of their parents.'

Though St. Hierom calls himself an Old Man in one part of this epistle, yet it was written a great while (30

years at least) before his death, and consequently 20 years before Pelagius vented his new opinion; for he speaks here of Eustochium, who was this lady's husband's sister, as a young girl; and yet his epistle to the said Eustochium, *de Virginitate Servanda*, was written 30 years before his epistle to Demetrias on the same subject, as he himself observes in the latter.

His mentioning how great a sin it would be in Christian parents to neglect the baptizing of their infants, renders that improbable (which yet some learned men of late have supposed to be true) that his own parents (who as it seems were Christians) had neglected the baptizing him in infancy; and that he was not baptized till he came to Rome; of which opinion, and the mistake on which it is grounded, I must say something, as also of some other such instances, in a * chapter on that subject.

Out of St. Austin's Book de Sermone Domini in Monte.

St. Austin was a man of note in the church; and continued writing of books for 40 years and more [288]. There never was any one man whose pains were so successful in healing the wounds of the church, caused by schisms and heresies: his moderate and popular way of arguing had a great effect. Beside his writing against the Manichees, of whom he had been one, and some Arians that were then yet left, he had a main hand in reducing the Donatists, and confuting the Pelagians. These latter began but 20 years before he died, viz. *Anno Dom.* 410 [310]; and he had wrote several books before they appeared. The quotations that I shall produce at present are out of those former books. One is that which I briefly mentioned (ch. 4 and 11) before, viz. in his

* Part 2, ch. 3.

Lib. 1, de Sermone Domini in Monte, c. 27.

He being there to explain that part of our Saviour's sermon, which forbids divorce, takes occasion to cite that advice of St. Paul (1 Cor. vii. 12) that a Christian should not put away his wife, though she as yet continued in heathenism or unbelief; and repeats the words that follow in the text, and gives his paraphrase upon them thus: —

"*Sanctificatus est enim, inquit, vir infidelis in uxore fideli; et sanctificata est mulier infidelis in fratre fideli.*

"Credo jam provenerat ut nonnullæ fœminæ per viros fideles, et viri per uxores fideles in fidem venirent; et quamvis non dicens nomina, exemplis tamen exhortatus est ad confirmandum consilium suum. Deinde sequitur.

Alioquin filii vestri immundi essent, nunc autem sancti sunt.

"Jam enim erant parvuli Christiani, qui sive authore uno ex parentibus, sive utroque consentiente sanctificati erant; quod non fieret si uno credente dissociaretur conjugium, et non toleraretur infidelitas conjugum usque ad opportunitatem credendi."

'*For*, says he,* *an unbelieving husband has been* '*sanctified by his believing wife; and an unbelieving* '*wife by her believing husband.*'

'I suppose it had then happened that several wives 'had been brought to the faith by their believing hus- 'bands; and husbands by their believing wives; and 'though he does not mention their names, yet he makes 'use of their example to confirm his advice. Then it 'follows,

'*Else were your children unclean, but now are they* '*holy.*

* 1 Cor. vii. 14.

'For there were then Christian infants that were 'sanctified [*or made holy, i. e. that were baptized*] 'some by the authority of one of their parents, some by 'the consent of both; which would not be if, as soon 'as one party believed, the marriage were dissolved, 'and the infidelity of the parties were not borne with 'till there were an opportunity of believing.'

Here we see St. Austin's sense of that expression of St. Paul, which has been of late the subject of so much debate. He judges St. Paul's meaning to be this:—It is advisable for a Christian husband, whose wife will not yet own the faith of Christ, not to put her away; because it is probable that he may in time gain her to the true religion. Such examples are, by God's grace, very frequent. You commonly see the unbelieving party *sanctified*, or brought to faith and baptism, by the believing one. Were it not so, that the faith of the one did generally prevail against the infidelity of the other, the children of such would be generally left in their unclean state, and be brought up to Heathenism; whereas we see now, on the contrary, that those of you that live in a state of marriage with unbelievers, do generally so far prevail, by God's grace, that *your children are made holy*, or sanctified, and dedicated to the true God by baptism.

If this explication do seem remote to us now, it is because we do not, so frequently as they did, use the word *sanctification* and *sanctified* for baptism and baptized. I believe it is not so little as a hundred times that St. Austin for one, when he is to speak of infants or other persons, baptized or to be baptized, expresses it *sanctified*, as we see he does here. If the reader pleases, he may turn back to chap. 9, where there is more said of that matter; and by what I shall produce * hereafter, it will appear that most of the antients understood this text as St. Austin does.

* Chap. 19.

Out of St. Austin's Books of Free-will.
Augustinus de Libro Arbitrio, lib. 3, c. 23.

This treatise St. Austin wrote when he was a * young man, against the Manichees, who maintain, That as there is one eternal principle or God that made the soul and all good things, so there is another that has created the body, and is the author of all wickedness, and other evils and calamities; and that one of these comes from a necessary principle as well as the other.

St. Austin shews that God created man with a free-will; and that all sin comes from the ill use of that free-will; and that all other evils are punishments for sin; and that every one shall be judged according as he has either used that freedom of will to good or abused it to evil; and then adds, —

"Some ignorant people make a slanderous objection against this doctrine, on account of infants dying, and of the bodily pains we often see them suffer; 'for,' they say, 'to what purpose was such a one born, since he died before he merited any thing? — or What place shall he have in the future judgment, who cannot be among the righteous, because he never did any good, nor among the wicked, since he never sinned?' To which we answer, "That in the constitution of the universe, and the fit connexion of all the creation in its places and times, no human person can have been created without reason, where not so much as the leaf of a tree is superfluously made; but that *that* is a superfluous question which they put of the merits of one that never merited any thing; for they need not fear that it should so happen that there can be a life in a middle state between good and bad, and not a sentence of the Judge in a middle way, between reward and punishment."

* A. g. Retractat. lib. 1, c. 9.

"Quo loco etiam illud perscrutari homines solent, sacramentum baptismi Christi quid parvulis prosit, cum eo accepto plerunque moriuntur priusquam ex eo quidquam, cognoscere potuerunt. Qua in re satis pie recteque creditur prodesse parvulo eorum fidem a quibus consecrandus offertur. Et hoc ecclesiæ commendat saluberrima autoritas, ut ex eo quisque sentiat quid sibi prosit fides sua, quando in aliorum quoque beneficium qui propriam nondum habent, potest aliena commodari. Quid enim profuit filio viduæ fides sua, quam utique mortuus non habebat? Cui tamen profuit matris, ut resurgeret."

On which head men are wont to ask this question also, 'What good the sacrament of Christ's baptism does 'to infants? — whereas, after they have received it, 'they often die before they are able to understand any 'thing of it. As to which matter it is piously and truly 'believed, that the faith of those by whom the child is 'offered to be consecrated, profits the child; and this 'the most sound authority of the church does commend, 'that hence every one may judge how profitable his own 'faith will be to himself, when even another person's 'faith is useful for the advantage of those that have as 'yet none of their own; — for how could the widow's 'son * be holpen by his own faith, whereof, being dead, 'he could have none? — and yet his mother's faith was 'useful for his being raised to life again.'

About 40 years after the writing of this book [328] (when Pelagianism had in the mean time arisen and sunk again) some Semi-Pelagians in France, who held still that opinion of Pelagius, that infants dying unbaptized shall, though they miss of the kingdom of Heaven, yet live eternally without punishment, made use of these words of St. Austin to uphold their tenet, as if he had therein expressed himself in favour of the opinion of such a middle state.

Of this, and of other their objections, one Hilary

* Luke vii. 12.

gives him notice by letter: — * "They plead (says he) that the case of infants is not to be made an example for that of grown persons; and even as to the case of infants, they say your Holiness so spoke of it as if you would have it counted an uncertain thing whether there be any punishment for them; and the negative to be more probable; and you may remember that in your third book concerning Free-will, your words are such as might give them this occasion."

But St. Austin in answer, † shews that they mistook what he spoke hypothetically, and *ad hominem* against the Manichees, for a positive speech. "Suppose (says he) that at that time when I began my books of Free-will, being then but a layman at Rome, or when I made an end of them, being then but a presbyter in Africa, I had been unresolved of that point, that infants not regenerated are under condemnation, and that those that are regenerated are thereby freed from it. I hope there is no man so unjust or envious as to be against my learning better.

"But whereas the truth is, That I ought not, therefore, to be thought to make any question of that matter, because I judged it fit to confute those against whom I disputed, in such a manner, that whether there be any punishment for original sin in infants, as the truth is,— or there be not, as some mistaken people think; yet still that mixture of the natures of good and evil, which the Manichees fondly maintain, would have no reason to be believed. God forbid that I should leave the matter of infants so, as to say it is uncertain whether those that are regenerated in Christ, if they die in infancy, do come to eternal salvation; and those who are not regenerated do fall into the second death; whereas that which is written, *By* ‡ *one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so it past upon all mankind*, can no otherwise be understood."

---

* Epistola Libro de Prædestinatione Sanctorum præfixa.
† Lib. de Bono Perseverantiæ, c. 12.
‡ Rom. v. 12.

This answer which he gives to the reflections which the Semi-Pelagians made upon these his first writings, may serve now for an answer to that which Grotius has reflected on them in like manner. He says, * "That St. Austin, before he was heated with the Pelagian disputes, never wrote any thing of the condemnation of unbaptized infants, not even to those lesser pains in the world to come;" intimating, that he was not of that opinion before; but supposing that were true that he did not, in his former writings, mention that matter; yet if we may believe him for his own sense, it was not but that he understood the thing to be so at the time of writing this book; but he had not the same occasion to speak of it that he had afterward.

This he more plainly expresses in a † letter to St. Hierom, written in the heat of the Pelagian controversy, where, having made mention of this book and this place, he says, "For in that book I did make answer concerning the baptism of infants, *non sufficienter, sed quantum illi operi satis videbatur*, not handling it fully, but as far as was needful in that work, that it does profit even those that are not sensible of it, and have as yet no faith of their own; but I thought it not needful at that time to say any thing concerning the condemnation of those infants that depart this life without it (*quia non quod nunc agitur agebatur*); because there was none of that dispute raised then which is now."

But I shall by and by have occasion to shew that, in other pieces written before the Pelagian times, he speaks of their condemnation.

Out of St. Austin's Books against the Donatists.

Augustinus de Baptismo contra Donatistas, lib. 4, c. 15.

St. Austin wrote this treatise, and many others, against the Donatists [300], a party of Christians in Africa, who had made a schism from the church some-

* Annot. in Mat. xix. 14. † Epist. 28.

time before he was born, on the account of one Cecilian, a bishop, who, as they said, had, in times of persecution under the Heathen Emperors, denied his religion, by giving up the Bible to be burnt; and yet afterward was suffered to continue and do the office of a bishop in the church.

Cecilian denied the matter of fact, and it could not be plainly proved; but these men were so peremptory and so fierce against him, as not only to renounce him, but also to renounce the communion of the church, which suffered him to continue among them in his office; and it came to such a height, that, in St. Austin's time, their party, which was very numerous, did so abhor the settled church, that if any one who had been baptized in the church came over to them, they told him the baptism which he had received in so impure and defiled a church, and from the hands of such wicked men, was null and void; and so they baptized him anew. The church did not so with them; but if any that had been baptized by them came over to the church, he was received as one whose baptism was valid, though given by schismatics.

St. Austin manages thus: — He shews the want of proof of the accusation, by producing the acts of court and records by which Cecilian had been acquitted; but besides, shews that, suppose it were true, one is not to forsake a church because of one or more wicked men that are suffered in it; and particularly in this treatise sets forth the impiety of their practice in re-baptizing. He shews that baptism once given in the right form, viz. in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is valid, — how heretical or impure soever the church be in which, or how wicked soever the man be, from whose hands he receives it. [One may here note by the by, that this rule of St. Austin does, by the consent of most antients, hold good, except in the case of the Paulianists, who seem to have kept the words of the form (though St. Austin had been informed otherwise) and yet their opinion concerning Christ was so abhorred by the Christians, that the Council of Nice ordered them to be rebaptized, as I

shall shew * hereafter]. He shews that the baptism is Christ's and not the minister's; and the validity thereof depends on God's authority, not on the goodness or sincerity of the person that officiates; and, consequently, that those who had been baptized by Cecilian, or any other wicked bishop, were to be accounted to have their baptism valid; and the priests ordained by him, were capable of giving baptism to others.

He goes on to shew, by the example of Simon Magus, that baptism received with a wicked heart and purpose (which is a worse circumstance) is yet valid; and that such a man is to repent of his wickedness, but not to be baptized again; and if a man that is baptized in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, have at that time some unsound opinion concerning the Trinity, or any Person thereof, he is to reform his opinion, but not to renew his baptism.

He proves this by the example of those who are baptized young, when they have but an uncouth sense, — or infants, when they have no sense at all, of the Articles of Faith, in these words: —

"Unde multi post baptismum proficientes, et maxime qui infantes vel pueri baptizati sunt, quanto magis intellectus eorum serenatur et illuminatur dum interior homo renovatur de die in diem, priores suas opiniones quas de Deo habebant, cum suis phantasmatibus ludificarentur, irrident et detestantes atque confitentes abjiciunt. Nec tamen ideo non accepisse baptismum existemantur, aut talem accepisse baptismum qualis fuit error ipsorum. Sed in eis et sacramenti integritas honoratur et mentis vanitas emendatur."

'So that many persons, increasing in knowledge after 'their baptism, and especially those who have been 'baptized either when they were infants, or when they 'were youths, as their understanding is cleared and en-'lightened, and their *inward man renewed day by day*, 'do themselves deride, and with abhorrence and con-'fession renounce the former opinions which they had 'of God, when they were imposed on by their own

* Part 2, ch. 5.

'imaginations; and yet they are not, therefore, ac-
'counted either not to have received baptism, or to
'have received a baptism of that nature that their
'error was; but in their case both the validity of the
'sacrament is acknowledged, and the vanity of their
'understanding rectified.'

A little after (c. 23) he having had occasion to speak of the penitent thief, who obtained salvation without baptism, shews that *that* is no more an argument against the necessity of baptism, where it may be had, than the example of baptized infants obtaining salvation without faith, is an argument against the necessity of faith, where the subject is capable of it; but that it is an argument that one of these may be without the other; and so that heretics, who neither have nor do teach the right faith, yet may give true baptism (if they give it in the right form) which ought not to be reiterated when the party comes to the true faith.

That was one thing with which the Donatists upbraided the Catholics, That they received heretics that came over to them, without giving them a new baptism.

He concludes this fourth book with these words:—

"Sicut autem in latrone, quia per necessitatem baptismus defuit, perfecta salus est, quia per pietatem spiritualiter affuit; sic et cum ipse præsto est, si per necessitatem desit quod latroni affuit, perficitur salus. Quod traditum tenet universitas ecclesiæ cum parvuli infantes baptizantur, qui certe nondum possunt corde credere ad justitiam et ore confiteri ad salutem, quod latro potuit; quinetiam flendo et vagiendo cum in eis mysterium celebratur, ipsis mysticis vocibus obstrepunt. Et tamen nullus Christianorum dixerit eos inaniter baptizari.

"Et si quisquam in hâc re Divinam autoritatem quærat; quanquam quod universa tenet ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum sed semper retentum est, non nisi autoritate apostolica traditum rectissime creditur; tamen veraciter conjicere possumus quid valeat in parvulis baptismi sacramentum ex circumcisione carnis quam prior

populus accepit. Quam priusquam acciperet justificatus est Abraham, sicut Cornelius etiam dono spiritus sancti priusquam baptizaretur ditatus est; dicit tamen apostolus de ipso Abraham, signum accepit circumcisionis, signaculum fidei justitiæ qua jam corde crediderat et deputatum ei erat ad justitiam. Cur ergo ei præceptum est ut omnem deinceps infantem masculum octavo die circumcideret, qui nondum poterat corde credere ut ei deputaretur ad Justitiam, nisi quia et ipsum per seipsum sacramentum multum valebat? Sicut ergo in Abraham præcessit fidei justitia et accessit circumcisio signaculum justitiæ fidei; ita in Cornelio præcessit sanctificatio spiritalis in dono Spiritus Sancti et accessit sacramentum regenerationis in lavacro baptismi. Et sicut in Isaac qui octavo suæ nativitatis die circumcisus est, præcessit signaculum justitiæ fidei; et (quoniam patris fidem imitatus est) secuta est in crescente ipsa justitia cujus signaculum in infante præcesserat. Ita et in baptizatis infantibus præcedit regenerationis sacramentum et (si Christianam tenuerint pietatem) sequitur in corde conversio, cujus mysterium præcessit in corpore. Et sicut in illo latrone quod ex baptismi sacramento defuerat complevit Omnipotentis benignitas, quia non superbia vel contemptu sed necessitate defuerat; sic in infantibus qui baptizati moriuntur eadem gratia Omnipotensis implere credenda est, quod non ex impia voluntate sed ex ætatis indigentia nec credere ad justitiam possunt nec ore confiteri ad salutem. Ideo cum alii pro eis respondeant, ut impleatur erga eos celebratio sacramenti, valet utique ad eorum consecrationem; quia ipsi respondere non possunt. At si pro eo qui respondere potest alius respondeat, non itidem valet. Quibus rebus omnibus ostenditur aliud esse sacramentum baptismi, aliud conversionem cordis, sed salutem hominis ex utroque compleri; nec si unum horum defuerit, ideo putare debemus consequens esse ut alterum desit, quia et illud sine isto potest esse in infantibus, et hoc sine illo potuit esse in latrone; complente Deo sive in illo sive in isto quod non ex voluntate defuerat. Cum vero ex

voluntate alterum horum defuerit, reatu hominem involvi.

"Et baptismus quidem potest inesse ubi conversio cordis defuerit; conversio autem cordis potest quidem inesse non percepto baptismo, sed contempto baptismo non potest; neque enim ullo modo dicenda est conversio cordis ad Deum, cum Dei Sacramentum contemnitur.

"Juste igitur reprehendimus, anathematizamus, detestamur, abominamur perversitatem cordis hæreticorum; sacramentum tamen evangelicum non ideo non habent, quia per quod utile est non habent. Quapropter cum ad fidem et veritatem veniunt et agentes pœnitentiam remitti sibi peccata deposcunt; non eos decipimus, neque fallimus, cum correctos a nobis ac reformatos in eo quo depravati atque perversi sunt, ad regnum cœlorum sic disciplinis cœlestibus erudimus, ut quod in eis integrum est nullo modo violemus; nec propter hominis vitium, si quid in homine Dei est, vel nullum vel vitiosum esse dicamus."

'And as the thief, who by necessity went without 'baptism was saved, because, by his pity he had it 'spiritually, — so where baptism is had, tho' the party 'by necessity go without that [*faith*] which the thief 'had, yet he is saved.

'Which the whole body of the church holds, as de'livered to them, in case of little infants baptized, 'who certainly cannot yet believe with the heart to 'righteousness or confess with the mouth to salvation, 'as the thief could; nay, by their crying and noise, 'while the sacrament is administering, they disturb the 'holy mysteries; and yet no Christian man will say 'they are baptized to no purpose.

'And if any one do ask for divine authority in this 'matter, though that which the *whole* church practises, 'and which has not been instituted by councils, but was 'ever in use, is very reasonably believed to be no other 'than a thing delivered [*or ordered*] by authority of the 'apostles, — yet we may besides take a true estimate,

'how much the sacrament of baptism does avail infants, 'by the circumcision which God's former people received.

'For Abraham was justified before he received that, '—as Cornelius was endued with the Holy Spirit before 'he was baptized; and yet the apostle says of Abraham, '*That he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of* '*the righteousness of the faith*, by which he had in 'heart believed, *and it had been counted to him for* '*righteousness*. Why then was he commanded 'thenceforward to circumcise all his male infants on 'the eighth day, when they could not yet believe with 'the heart that it might be counted to them for righteousness, but for this reason, because the sacrament 'itself is of itself of great import? Therefore, as in 'Abraham, the righteousness of faith went before, and 'circumcision, the seal of the righteousness of faith, 'came after, —so in Cornelius, the spiritual sanctification by the gift of the Holy Spirit went before, and 'the sacrament of regeneration, by the laver baptism, 'came after; and as Isaac, who was circumcised the 'eighth day, the seal of the righteousness of faith 'went before, and (as he was a follower of his father's 'faith) the righteousness itself, the seal whereof had 'gone before in his infancy, came after; so in infants 'baptized, the sacrament of regeneration goes before, 'and (if they put in practice the Christian religion) 'conversion of the heart, the mystery whereof went before in their body, comes after.

'And as in that thief's case, what was wanting of the 'sacrament of baptism the mercy of the Almighty made 'up; because it was not out of pride or contempt but 'of necessity that it was wanting, —so in infants that 'die after they are baptized, it is to be believed that 'the same grace of the Almighty does make up that defect, that by reason, not of a wicked will, but of want 'of age, they can neither believe with the heart to righteousness, nor confess with the mouth unto salvation; 'so that when others answer for them, that they may 'have this sacrament given them, it is valid for their

'consecration, because they cannot answer for themselves; but if for one that is able to answer himself, another should answer, it would not be valid. By all which it appears that the sacrament of baptism is one thing, and conversion of the heart another; but that the salvation of a person is completed by both of them; and if one of these be wanting, we are not to think that it follows that the other is wanting; since one may be without the other in an infant, and the other was without that in the thief, — God Almighty making up both in one and the other case that which was not wilfully wanting.

'But when either of these is wilfully wanting, it involves the person in guilt; and baptism indeed may be had where conversion of the heart is wanting; but conversion of the heart, though it may be where baptism is not had, cannot be where it is contemned; for that is by no means to be called *Conversion of the Heart to God*, where the sacrament of God is contemned.

'Well may we, therefore, reprehend, anathematize, detest, and abhor the perversion of heart that is in heretics; but yet we must not say that they therefore have not the gospel sacrament, because they have not that which should make it useful to them.

'Therefore, when they come to the true faith, and being penitent, do desire that their faults may be pardoned, we do not deceive or cheat them, when correcting and reforming in them that wherein they were depraved and perverted, we do instruct them with holy discipline for the kingdom of Heaven in such a manner as that we do by no means violate that in them which is valid; nor for the fault of the man say that *that* which is of God in the man is either null or faulty.'

I have transcribed this passage the larger, because Mr. Danvers, who had set up a pretence that the Donatists found fault with the Catholics for baptizing infants, would prove it from this place. He had said

* "That Austin's third and fourth books against the Donatists do demonstrate that they denied infants baptism; wherein he manages the argument for infants baptism against them with great zeal, enforcing it by several arguments, but especially from apostolical tradition; and cursing, with great bitterness, they that would not embrace it;" and when his answerers jogged him, and told him That, in the third book, there was never a word about it, — he said the fourth book did however shew it; and yet in the fourth book there is nothing but what I here produce; and any one that can give any tolerable guess at the sense of what he reads, sees by this and the rest of the book, that St. Austin does not here argue against the Donatists, as if they denied infant baptism; but prove that baptism received from the hands of heretical or depraved priests is valid, though they give the baptized person a wrong account of the faith, by this reason that infants baptism is valid, though they have as yet no account of the faith at all; and I have already † shewn from Optatus, that the Catholics and Donatists had no difference about the nature of baptism, or way of administering it; but only about the purity or orthodoxy of the persons that gave it; and shall, by and by ‡ have occasion to shew particularly that they baptized infants as well as the Catholics.

But what does he mean by saying "That St. Austin cursed?" &c.

The Donatists reproached the Catholics for receiving to their communion such as had been baptized among heretics; as Arians, Appollinarists, &c. without giving them, upon their coming to the communion of the church, a new baptism: as if they thereby owned communion with such heretics, or approved their doctrine. St. Austin answers, as we see, "We do [as well as you] reprehend, anathematize, &c. the perversion of heart [or false doctrine] of the heretics; but yet we must not

* Treatise of Baptism, part 2, ch. 7, p. 223.
† Ch. 9. ‡ Ch. 16.

therefore say that they have not the sacrament," &c. This is what this man, who could find Antipædobaptism in every Latin book that he looked into, calls "cursing they that would not embrace infant baptism."

Mr. Baxter says on this occasion, * "Either this man had seen and read these books of St. Austin, or he had not. If not, does he use God's church and the souls of poor ignorant people with any tenderness? &c. If he understand not Latin, how unfit is he to give us the history of these antiquities? &c.; but if he have read them, then I can scarce match him among all the falsifiers I know in the world. I dare not be so uncharitable to him as to think that he ever read them." But to leave him, and go on.

Though St. Austin speak of infant baptism in this place; but, by the by, his words are, we see, a full evidence that it was then *universally* practised, and had been so beyond the memory of any man, or of any record: that they took it to be a thing that had not been *enacted by any council*; but had *ever been in use* from the beginning of Christianity; and they had then but 300 years to look back to the times of the apostles; whereas we now have 1600; and the writings and records which are now lost were then extant, and easily known.

Moreover, for the sorts or sects of Christians that were then, he says That *nullus Christianorum*, none of all the Christians (and then certainly not the Donatists with whom he was talking) had any other opinion but that it was useful or necessary.

This is to be understood with a limitation, which I shall shew † that he expresses elsewhere, provided they were such as made use of any baptism at all; for there were some sects that called themselves *Christians* (but they were hardly allowed that name by any others) who utterly refused the use of any baptism at all; of whom I shall give some account at a place (part 2, ch. 5) convenient.

---

* Confutation of the Strange Forgeries of Mr. H. D. sect. 2, ch. 4, § 7.

† Part 2, ch. 5.

Out of St. Austin's Letter to Boniface.

Augustini Epistola ad Bonifacium Episcopum, Epist. 23.

Boniface [308], a bishop of St. Austin's acquaintance, had wrote to him to desire his explication of two matters that appeared to him difficult to resolve: they do both relate to infants baptism.

One was "Whether such parents do their infants that are baptized any hurt, who carry them to the heathen temples and sacrifices to be cured by those impious rites of some infirmity they have? and if they thereby do them no hurt, then how it comes to pass that the faith of the parents stands them in stead when they are baptized, and yet the apostacy of their parents does them no hurt?"

The other was "How that can be reconciled to truth which the Godfather answers in the child's name at baptism, viz. That he does believe, does renounce, will obey, &c. when he at present has no sense at all; and what he will have hereafter nobody knows?"

A part of what St. Austin answers to the first of these I have already recited in the * chapter of St. Cyprian's sayings; because he does in this answer cite and explain one of the passages of Cyprian which I had there cited; and another part of it in chap. 3, because it gives a full proof that the antients took the word *regeneration* for baptism, exclusively of all other senses.

The substance of the answer is, That original sin is at first derived from the parents to the child, because the child is at first a part of the parents: that after he is become a separate living person, the faith of the parents, or others that bring him to baptism, is available to him; because "the regenerating Spirit is one in the grown persons that bring the child, and in the child that is brought: but when the same grown persons commit that wickedness on the child, offering him, and endeavouring to engage him in the sacrilegious bonds of De-

* Chap. vi.

vils, there is not then one soul in both of them that the crime should be communicated; for sin is not so communicated by the will of another which is distinct, as grace is communicated by the Holy Spirit, which is one and the same; for the same Holy Spirit may be in this and in that person, although they mutually know it not one of another, and so the grace may be common; but the spirit of a human person cannot be in this and in that person, so that one sinning and the other not sinning, the guilt should be common."

Some remaining parts of the answer relating to some particular things that Boniface had said do here follow:

"Nec illud te moveat, quod quidam non ea fide ad baptismum percipiendum parvulos ferunt, ut gratia spirituali ad vitam regenerentur æternam, sed quod eos putant hoc remedio tempor alem retinere vel recipere sanitatem. Non enim propterea illi non regenerantur, quia non ab istis hac intentione offeruntur. Celebrantur enim per eos necessaria ministeria, &c.—Spiritus autem ille Sanctus qui habitat in sanctis, ex quibus una illa columba deargentata charitatis igne conflatur, agit quod agit etiam per servitutem aliquando non solum simpliciter ignorantium, verum etiam damnabiliter indignorum. Offeruntur quippe parvuli ad percipiendam spiritualem gratiam non tam ab eis quorum gestantur manibus, quamvis et ab ipsis si et ipsi boni fideles sunt, quam ab universa societate sanctorum atque fidelium. Ab omnibus namque offerri recte intelliguntur quibus placet quod offerantur, et quorum sancta atque individua charitate ad communicationem Sancti Spiritus adjuvantur. Tota hoc ergo mater Ecclesia quæ in sanctis est, facit; quia tota omnes, tota singulos parit. Nam si Christiani baptismi sacramentum, quod unum atque idipsum est, etiam apud hæreticos valet ad consecrationem, quamvis ad vitæ æternæ participationem non sufficiat: quæ consecratio reum quidem facit hæreticum extra Domini gregem habentem Dominicum characterem; corrigendum tamen admonet sana doctrina, non iterum similiter consecrandum: quanto potius in Catholica Ecclesia etiam per stipulæ ministerium fru-

menta purganda portantur, ut ad massæ societatem mediante area perducantur?

"Illud autem nolo te fallat, ut existimes reatus vinculum ex Adam tractum aliter non posse dirumpi, nisi parvuli ad percipiendam Christi gratiam a parentibus offerantur. Sic enim scribens dicis; ut sicut parentes autores fuerunt ad eorum pœnam, per fidem parentum identidem justificentur. Cum videas multos non offerri a parentibus, sed etiam a quibuslibet extraneis: sicut a dominis servuli aliquando offeruntur; et nonnunquam mortuis parentibus suis parvuli baptizantur ab eis oblati qui in illis hujusmodi misericordiam præbere potuerunt. Aliquando etiam quos crudeliter parentes exposuerunt nutriendos a quibuslibet nonnunquam a sacris virginibus colliguntur, et ab eis offeruntur ad baptismum quæ certe proprios filios non habuerunt ullos nec habere disponunt."

'Let not that disturb you, that some people do not 'bring their infants to baptism with that faith [*or purpose*] that they may by spiritual grace be regenerated 'to eternal life, but because they think they do procure or preserve their bodily health by this remedy; 'for the children do not, therefore, fail of being regenerated, because they are not brought by the others 'with this intention; for the necessary offices are performed by them, &c.—And the Holy Spirit that 'dwells in the saints, out of whom that silver dove that 'is but one, is by the fire of charity compacted, does 'what he does sometimes by the means of men not only 'simply ignorant, but also damnably unworthy; for 'infants are offered for the receiving of the spiritual 'grace, not so much by those in whose hands they are 'brought (though by those too, if they be good faithful 'Christians) as by the whole congregation of saints and 'faithful men; for they are rightly said to be offered 'by all those whose desire it is that they should be 'offered, and by whose holy and united charity they are 'assisted towards the communication of the Holy Spirit; so that the whole church of the saints does this

'office as a mother; for the whole church brings forth 'all her children, and the whole brings forth each par- 'ticular.

'For if the sacrament of Christian baptism, which is 'one and the same, be available even among heretics 'for the consecration of a person, though it be not suf- 'ficient for his obtaining of eternal life (which conse- 'cration involves the heretic in the guilt of sin for using 'the Lord's mark without the compass of the Lord's 'flock; and yet the orthodox doctrine teaches that such 'a person is to be reformed, but not to be consecrated 'anew) — how much more in the Catholic church may 'the corn that is to be cleaned be brought in by the 'means of the straw, that by the help of the floor it 'may be gathered to the rest of the heap!

'But I would not have you mistake so as to think 'that the bond of guilt derived from Adam cannot be 'broken, unless the children be offered for receiving the 'grace of Christ by their own parents. For so you 'speak in your letter, That as the parents were authors 'of their punishment, so they may also, by the faith of 'their parents, be justified.

'Whereas you see that a great many are offered, not 'by their parents, but by any other persons, as the in- 'fant slaves are sometimes offered by their masters: 'and sometimes when the parents are dead the infants 'are baptized, being offered by any that can afford to 'shew this compassion on them; and sometimes infants, 'whom their parents have cruelly exposed to be brought 'up by those that light on them, are now and then 'taken up by the holy virgins, and offered to baptism 'by them who have no children of their own, nor de- 'sign to have any. And in all this there is nothing 'else done than what is written in the gospel, when our 'Lord asked who was neighbour to him that was 'wounded by thieves, and left half dead on the road? 'and it was answer'd, *He that shewed mercy on him.*'

Here we see (beside the resolution of the main question, both Boniface and St. Austin taking it for granted

that infants are to be baptized) that the ordinary use then was for the parents to answer for their children; but yet that this was not counted so necessary as that a child could not be baptized without that circumstance. Any one that was on any equitable account owner of the child, might bring it to baptism.

Neither did the baptism depend on the holiness, or right faith, or intention of those that brought the child; it was supposed to be done by the order and at the desire of the church, and particularly of those that assisted with their prayers at the office.

He next proceeds to speak of the other question put by Boniface.

" Difficillimam sane quæstionem tibi proposuisse visus es in extremo inquisitionis tuæ; ea videlicet intentione qua soles vehementer cavere mendacium. Si constituam, inquis, ante te parvulum, et interrogem utrum cum creverit, futurus sit castus, vel fur non sit futurus? sine dubio respondebis, nescio. Et utrum in eadem parvula ætate constitutus cogitet aliquid boni vel mali? dices, nescio. Si itaque de moribus ejus futuris nihil audes certi promittere, et de præsenti ejus cogitatione: quid est illud quod quando ad baptismum offeruntur, pro eis parentes tanquam fide dictores respondent et dicunt illos facere quod illa ætas cogitare non potest, et si potest, occultum est? Interrogamus enim eos a quibus offeruntur et dicimus, credit in Deum? de illa ætate quæ utrum sit Deus ignorat. Respondet, credit; et ad cætera sic respondetur singula quæ geruntur. Unde miror parentes in istis rebus tam fidenter pro parvulo respondere, ut dicant eum tanta bona facere quæ ad horam qua baptizatur, baptizator interrogat: tamen eadem hora si subjiciam; erit castus qui baptizatur? Aut, non erit fur? nescio utrum audet dicere aliquis, aliquid horum erit, vel, non erit; sicut mihi sine dubitatione respondet quod credat in Deum, et quod se convertat ad Deum.

" Deinde scripta tua concludens adjungis et dicis; ad istas ergo quæstiones peto breviter respondere dig-

neris, ita ut non mihi de consuetudine præscribas, sed rationem reddas.

" His literis tuis lectis et relectis, et quantum temporis augustiæ sinebant consideratis, recordatus sum ne bridium amicum meum: qui cum esset rerum obscurarum, ad doctrinam pietatis maxime pertinentium, diligentissimus et acerrimus inquisitor, valde oderat de quæstione magna responsionem brevem: et quisquis hoc poposcisset, agerrime ferebat: eumque, si ejus persona pateretur, vultu indignabundus et voce cohibebat: indignum deputans qui talia quæreret, cum de re tanta quam multa dici possent deberentque nesciret. Sed ego tibi non similiter ut solebat ille, succenseo. Es enim episcopus multis curis occupatus, ut ego: unde nec tibi facile vacat prolixum aliquid legere nec mihi scribere. Nam ille tunc adolescens, qui talia breviter nolebat audire, et multa in nostra sermocinatione quærebat, et ab ocioso quærebat ociosus. Tu vero cogitans nunc quis et a quo ista flagites, breviter de re tanta respondere me jubes. Ego facio quantum possum: Dominus adjuvet, ut quod postulas possim.

" Nempe sæpe ita loquimur, ut pascha propinquante dicamus crastinam vel perendinam esse Domini passionem; cum ille ante tam multos annos passus sit, nec omnino nisi semel ista passio facta sit. Nempe ipso die Dominico dicimus; hodie Dominus resurrexit: Cum ex quo resurrexit tot anni transierint. Cur nemo tam ineptus est ut nos ita loquentes arguat esse mentitos, nisi quia istos dies secundum illorum quibus hæc gesta sunt. similitudinem nuncupamus? Ut dicatur ipse dies qui non est ipse, sed revolutione temporis similis ejus: et dicatur illo die fieri propter sacramenti celebrationem, quod non illo die sed jam olim factum est. Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in scipso? Et tamen in sacramento non solum per omnes paschæ solemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur. Nec utique mentitur qui interrogatus eum responderit immolari. Si enim sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum quarum sacramenta sunt non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerunque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt.

"Sicut ergo secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est; ita sacramentum fidei fides est. Nihil est autem aliud credere quam fidem habere. Ac per hoc cum respondetur parvulum credere, qui fidei nondum habet affectum; respondetur fidem habere propter fidei sacramentum, et convertere se ad Deum propter conversionis sacramentum: quia et ipsa responsio ad celebrationem pertinet sacramenti. Sicut de ipso baptismo apostolus; consepulti, inquit, sumus Christo per baptismum in mortem: non ait, sepulturam significamus; sed prorsus ait; consepulti sumus. Sacramentum ergo tantæ rei non nisi ejusdem rei vocabulo nuncupavit.

"Itaque parvulum et si nondum fides illa quæ in credentium voluntate consistit, jam tamen ipsius fidei sacramentum fidelem facit. Nam sicut credere respondetur, sic etiam fidelis vocatur, non [*ad*] rem ipsam mente annuendo, sed ipsius rei sacramentum percipiendo. Cum autem homo sapere cæperit, non illud sacramentum repetit, sed intelligit; ejusque veritati consona etiam voluntate coaptabitur. Hoc quamdiu non potest, valebit sacramentum ad ejusdem tutelam adversus contrarias potestates: et tantum valebit, ut si ante rationis usum ex hac vita emigraverit, per ipsum sacramentum, commendante ecclesiæ charitate, ab illa condemnatione quæ per unum hominem intravit in mundum, Christiano adjutorio liberetur. Hoc qui non credit, et fieri non posse arbitratur, profecto infidelis est, etsi habeat fidei sacramentum: longeque melior est ille parvulus qui etiamsi fidem nondum habeat in cogitatione, non ei tamen obicem contrariæ cogitationis opponit; unde sacramentum ejus salubriter percipit.

"Respondi sicut existimo quæstionibus tuis quantum attinet ad minus capaces et contentiosos non satis, quantum autem ad pacatos et intelligentes plus forte quam sat est. Nec tibi ad excusationem meam objeci firmissimam consuetudinem, sed saluberrimæ consuetudinis reddidi quam potui rationem.

'You reckon you have proposed a very hard ques-

'tion in the latter part of your letter, according to that 'temper of yours, by which you are wont to be exceeding cautious of any thing that looks like a lie. You 'say thus:—

'Suppose I set before you an infant, and ask you 'whether, when he grows up, he will be a chaste 'man? or, whether he will be no thief? Your answer doubtless will be *I cannot tell*; and, whether he 'in that infant age have any good or evil thought? 'you will say *I know not*. Since, therefore, you dare 'not say any thing either concerning his future behaviour or his present thoughts, what is the meaning 'that, when they are brought to baptism, their parents, 'as sponsors for them, make answer and say, That 'they do that which that age can have no thoughts of? 'or if they have, no body knows what they are;—for 'we ask those by whom they are brought, and say 'Does he believe in God? concerning that age which 'has no knowledge whether there be a God or not: 'they answer He does believe: and so in like manner 'answer is made to all the rest; so that I wonder how 'the parents do in those matters answer so confidently 'for the child that he does this or that good thing 'which the baptizer demands at the time of his baptism; and yet, if at the same time I ask Will this 'baptized person prove chaste? or, not prove a thief? 'I question whether any one dare so answer, He will, 'or, will not, be such or such an one,—as they answer 'without any hesitation that he does believe in God; 'he does turn to God.

'And then you conclude your letter with these words:

'I entreat you to give me a short answer to these 'questions, in such a manner as that you do not urge to 'me the prescription of the customariness of the thing, 'but give me the reason of it.

'When I had read your letter over and over, and 'had considered it as far as my short time would allow, it made me call to mind my friend Nebridius,

'who being a very diligent and sagacious inquirer into 'matters that were obscure, especially such as concern 'religion, could not endure a short answer to a weighty 'question, and took it very ill if any one desired such 'a thing; and would with an angry voice and look re-'primand him, if he were a person that might be so 'used, as counting him unfit to ask such questions, 'who did not consider how much might and ought to 'be said on so great a matter.

'But I do not pretend to be angry with you in such a 'manner as he was wont to be; for you are a bishop 'that have a great many cares upon you, as well as I; 'so that neither have you the leisure to read a long dis-'course, nor I to write one; for he being then a young 'man, that would not be answered in brief to such 'things, but spent a great deal of talk with me, in-'quired as one at leisure from one that was so too: but 'you, considering now your own circumstances that 'ask, and mine that am asked, bid me answer briefly 'about so great a matter; and that I here do as well as 'I can. I pray God to assist me, that I may be able 'to satisfy your demand.

'You know we often express ourselves so, as that 'when Good Friday is nigh, we say *To-morrow*, or, '*next day is our Lord's passion*; though it be a great 'many years ago that he suffered, and his passion was 'never performed but once; so on the Lord's Day we 'say, This day our Lord arose; though since he arose 'it be so many years. Why is there no body so silly as 'to say we lie when we speak so, but for this reason; 'because we give names to those days, from the re-'presentation they make us of those on which the 'things were indeed done; so as that is called the very 'day, which is not the very day, but answers to it in 'the revolution of time: and that which is not done 'on that day, but was done a long time ago, is spoken 'of as done on that day, because the sacrament of it is 'then celebrated. Was not Christ in his own person 'offered up [*or sacrificed*] once for all? and yet in the 'sacrament he is offered in the church [*or, in, or, to,*

'*or among the people*] not only every Easter, but every 'day; nor does he lie, who, being asked, says He is 'offered; for sacraments would not be sacraments, if 'they had not a resemblance of those things whereof 'they are the sacraments; and from this resemblance 'they commonly have the names of the things them-'selves.

'As therefore the sacrament of Christ's body is after 'a certain fashion Christ's body; and the sacrament of 'Christ's blood is Christ's blood, — so the sacrament 'of faith is faith, and to believe is nothing else but to 'have faith; and so when an infant, that has not yet the 'faculty of faith, is said to believe, he is said to have 'faith, because of the sacrament of faith; and to turn 'to God, because of the sacrament of conversion; be-'cause that answer belongs to the celebration of the 'sacrament. So the apostle on this same subject of 'baptism says*, *We are buried together with Christ by 'baptism unto death:* he does not say, We signify a 'burial; but he uses the word itself, *We are buried*; 'so that he calls the sacrament of so great a thing by 'the name of the thing itself.

'And so an infant, though he be not yet constituted 'a *fidele* [*a faithful Christian*] by that faith which con-'sists in the will of believers, yet he is by the sacra-'ment of that faith; for as he is said to believe, so he is 'called a *fidele*; not from his having the thing itself in 'his mind, but from his receiving the sacrament of it.

'And when a person begins to have a sense of things, 'he does not repeat that sacrament, but understands 'the force of it, and by consent of will squares himself 'to the true meaning of it: and till he can do this, the 'sacrament will avail to his preservation against all 'contrary powers; and so far it will avail, that if he 'depart this life before the use of reason, he will by 'this Christian remedy of the sacrament itself (the 'charity of the church recommending him) be made

* Rom. vi. 4.

'free from that condemnation* which by one man entered into the world.

'He that does not believe this, and thinks it cannot 'be done, is indeed an infidel, though he have the sa-'crament of faith: and that infant is much better who, 'though he have not faith in his mind, yet puts no bar 'of a contrary mind against it, and so receives the sa-'crament to his soul's health.

'I have given such an answer to your questions as I 'suppose is, to ignorant or contentious people, not 'enough; and to understanding and quiet people per-'haps more than enough: neither have I, to spare my 'pains, urged to you the custom's being so firmly 'grounded; but I have, as well as I could, explained 'to you the reason of that wholesome custom.'

How skilful or judicious the reader will judge this explication of the reason of the custom to be, I know not; nor is it much material, since we are not now enquiring how acute St. Austin was, but what it was that he and the rest knew to be true in point of fact; and hereby we perceive plainly these matters following.

1. That *that* was the practice for the Godfathers (who were, as I said, usually the parents) to make these answers in the child's name: the use of Godfathers appeared before † from the words of Tertullian; but here it is set forth more particularly: and St. Austin says that these answers do belong to, or are a necessary appurtenance of, the sacrament; and he had said in the former part of the letter (which I omitted because of the length) that they are *Verba sacramentorum, sine quibus parvulus consecrari non potest:* 'Words of 'the sacrament, without which an infant cannot be 'baptized.' Whether he would not have excepted the case of necessity in danger of sudden death (as the Church of England does) if there had been occasion of speaking of that, I know not; but it is plain he would

* Rom. v. 18. † Ch. 4.

have been against those that either decry this practice, or count it a thing of no moment. The church of Christ has always taken care that the blessings of God promised in this sacrament may be understood as conveyed conditionally, or by way of covenant; which these questions and answers do most lively express.

2. We see that they then held as certain, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved: for St. Austin here says in these last words, that he that does not believe this is an infidel; which he would not say if it had been counted at all doubtful. The same thing might have been observed from what he says above: "God forbid that I should make any question whether infants regenerated and dying in infancy do come to eternal salvation."

3. If those learned Benedictines who have managed the last edition of this father's works to set his books and epistles in their chronological order, have placed this epistle right, then we see here another proof of the mistake of Grotius, who maintains, * as I said, that St. Austin, before he was heated with the Pelagian controversy, did never assert the condemnation of infants dying unbaptized; no, not to those lesser or milder sufferings in the world to come: for they place this epistle (which is in their edition the 98th) *anno Dom.* 408, which was before Pelagius vented his heresy: and yet here St. Austin, in saying "They will, if they die before the use of reason, be freed by this Christian remedy of the sacrament from that condemnation which by one man entered into the world," plainly supposes that they would otherwise have been liable to it.

4. There are two other things observable from his words here, which are well worth the noting, though they do not relate to our subject: one is, that he speaks so as that we may be sure he had no notion of transubstantiation; for to say that sacraments have a likeness, or resemblance, of those things whereof they are the sacraments, and from this resemblance they commonly have

* Annot. in Mat. xix. 14.

the names of the things themselves; and to exemplify this by saying The sacrament of Christ's body is Christ's body, and the sacrament of his blood is his blood after a certain manner, or fashion; and to speak of this as a thing so understood by all, is proof enough that he neither believed, nor had conceived or heard of any such doctrine as makes the body and blood of Christ to be there in a proper sense.

Another is, that it was then the common custom for Christians in some churches, and probably in that where he lived, to receive the communion of Christ's body every day; for so he says, Christ in himself [*or, in his own person*] was offered [*or sacrificed*] but once; but yet in the sacrament [*or in a sacramental way*] he is offered up every day. It is certain this was the custom then of the Christians at Rome; and that in many of the eastern churches, and some of the western, the custom was not to receive so often; for St. Hierom and St. Austin have each of them written letters on this subject, in answer to some that had desired their opinion in relation to this difference; as *Aug. Epist.* 118, *ad Januarium. Hieronym. Epist.* 28, *ad Lucinum Bæticum.* See also *Aug. de Sermone Domini in Monte, lib.* 2, *c.* 12, and *Gennad. de Eccl. Dogm. c.* 63. Their opinion is, that in that and all such like matters that are not determined by Scripture, nor by the authority of the universal church, one should follow the usage of that church in which one lives: and St. Austin there says that he had by long experience found this rule (which had been given him by St. Ambrose) to be of unspeakable use for the quieting men's minds, and for the peace of the church.

This they say of receiving every day; but no person then would have spoken with such indifference of the custom of any people (if there had then been any such) that used to receive so seldom as many among the Protestants now-a-days do: for *Genhadius loc. citat.* says, "Those that communicate every day, I do neither commend nor blame; but I would advise and persuade people to communicate every Lord's Day, provided they

have a purpose of forsaking sin: but this I speak of those who have not any capital or mortal crimes lying on their consciences," &c. Those he advises to do penance first.

6. He does both in this letter, and also in the passage last before rehearsed, and in many other places, so speak, as plainly to shew that he did not think nor pretend that infants that are baptized have, in any proper sense, faith, or repentance, or conversion of the heart, &c. How much soever he is here pressed with the difficulty of explaining the reason why the Godfather answers, in the child's name, *He does believe*, he does not, for all that, fly to the justifying of so great a paradox, as to say that the child does indeed, in a proper sense, understand, believe, or disbelieve any thing. He shews the words are true in a sacramental sense; but does not maintain they are so in a proper one. Nay, he plainly yields they are not: he grants that infants "cannot as yet either believe with the heart, or confess with the mouth."

When, at other places *, he argues that infants, after they are baptized, are no longer to be counted either among the infidels or *catechumeni*; but among the *fideles* or *credentes*, — yet still he means and explains himself, as he does here, "That they are constituted *fideles*, — not by that faith which consists in the will of believers, but by the sacrament of that faith."

He does indeed hold, that the Holy Spirit does do offices for the infant, and is in the infant. You see here his words, "The regenerating Spirit is one in those that bring the child, and in the child that is brought;" and in that part of the epistle which I left out, because of the length, he says, *Aqua exhibens forinsecus sacramentum gratia, et Spiritus operans intrinsecus beneficium gratiæ, solvens vinculum culpæ, &c.* 'The 'water affording outwardly the sacrament of the grace, 'and the Spirit operating inwardly the benefit of the 'grace, loosing the bond of guilt, &c. do regenerate:'—

* De Peccatorum Meritis, lib. 1, c. 25, 33, &c.

but he supposes the infants to be merely passive, and not to know, understand, or co-operate any thing themselves.

In his epistle to Dardanus (epist. 57) he says, "It is a wonderful thing to consider how God dwells in some that know him not; and in some that do know him he does not dwell; for they who, *when they know God, glorify him not as God, nor are thankful*, do not belong to his temple; and infants sanctified by the sacrament of Christ, regenerated by the Holy Spirit, do belong to his temple, who, though they be regenerated, cannot yet, by reason of their age, know God;" — and afterward, "We affirm, therefore, that the Holy Spirit dwells in baptized infants, though they know it not; for after the same manner they know him not, though he be in them, as they know not their own soul. The reason whereof, which they cannot yet make use of, is in them as a spark raked up, which will kindle as they grow in years."

Some modern divines, especially of the Lutherans, have gone farther, and do † maintain that infants have faith, and do believe after a certain manner; but not in the same way or manner that adult people do, whose faith comes by hearing, thought, meditation, understanding, &c. for they grant that infants have none of these; and what sort of faith it is that they have, cannot, as they confess, be explained.

A late philosophical divine of the Church of Rome has outdone all: he has ‡ acquainted us with the mechanism by which original sin is formed in the brain of an infant before he is born; and also how, at baptism, it is rectified. It is worth knowing. It is thus: — "The mother has a sinful inclination and love to the world, pleasure, &c. There are tracks or traces in her brain running all this way. The child in her womb has by sympathy the same traces bred in his brain; so he

† Chemnitii Examen. Part 2, de Baptismo, can. 18.

‡ Malbranch. Search. Illustrations on ch. 7 of the First Part of the Second Book.

has, before he is born, corrupt inclinations, and is a sinner." The difficulty is, how this is rectified at baptism.

For this, he supposes the child to have, at the time of baptism, one strong "actual motion of love to God;" and says "One single instant is sufficient for the exercise of that act of love; and concupiscence is, as it were, mortified that moment;"— and the strangest thing that he says is, "It should not be thought strange that I suppose it possible for children to love God with a love of choice at the time of their baptism; for since," &c.

I think this learned author does somewhere * observe, in his book, "That men of learning are most subject to error; and, that those who are most hot in the search of truth, are the men that lead us into infinite errors." He gives several reasons for this, why such men do sometimes fall into greater mistakes than vulgar people. One more may, perhaps, be added to them: — Vulgar people, having no assistance from learning or philosophy, have nothing but common sense to trust to, — so they generally keep close to that: they seldom allow themselves to maintain any opinion that is very remote from it. It was not these men that adventured first to teach the world, that *that* is, in a proper sense, the body of a man, which we see, when we have it in our hands, to be a piece of bread. On the contrary, they can hardly believe it, tho' the learned have taught them so. Neither was it for one of them to have found, with all their search, this truth, That an infant, at the time of baptism, loves God with a love of choice. They will hardly believe it of any infant at any time, — much less when they see the child fast asleep at the time of baptism, or (as St. Austin observes † they often are) in a fit of crying and fretfulness all the while; which, as he remarks, would be very sinful, if they had any understanding.

The foresaid author says indeed, "We ought not positively to affirm this, That children are justified by formal acts of their will;" and he had reason; for the Coun-

* Lib. 2, part 2, ch. 4. † Epist. 57.

cil of Trent suppose the contrary, when they say, * "If any one shall say that baptized infants, because they have not the act of believing, are not to be accounted *fideles*, &c. let him be anathema." I suppose that church have at last learned not to hang any more millstones on the neck of their religion.

He says also, "They that have treated of the effect of baptism in the ages past, have omitted the explaining the regeneration of infants by the actual motions of their heart,— not that they were induced by strong reasons to judge it impossible, for their works do not shew they have ever so much as examined it;" but St. Austin thought the evidence of sense to be a strong reason, when he says, in the foresaid epistle † to Dardanus, "If we should go about to prove by discourse, that infants, which as yet have no knowledge of human things, have knowledge of divine things, I am afraid we should seem to offer an affront to our senses, when, let us say what we will, the evidence of the truth overpowers all the force of our talk." He was not so hardy as, either in this or the other sacrament, or in any other point, to tack any thing to our faith that is contrary to our sense; and he goes on there to observe, that infants, even then when they begin to talk, have so little sense or understanding, that, if they should always keep to that pitch, they would be idiots.

Most of the Pædobaptists go no farther than St. Austin does; they hold that God, by his Spirit, does, at the time of baptism, seal and apply to the infant that is there dedicated to him, the promises of the covenant of which he is capable, viz. adoption, pardon of sin, translation from the state of nature to that of grace, &c. On which account the infant is said to be *regenerated of* [or by] *the Spirit*:— not that God does, by any miracle at that time, illuminate or convert the mind of the child:— and for original sin, or the corruption of nature, they hold that God, by his covenant, does abolish the guilt of it, — receives the child to his mercy in Christ, — and

* Sess. 7, Can. de Baptismo, 13. † Epist. 57.

consigns to him by promise such grace as shall afterward, by the use of means, if he live, be sufficient to keep it under, but not wholly to extirpate it, in this life. It is left as the subject of trial and of a continual Christian warfare; and this is the opinion of St. Austin *, and of the antients in general.

The Pelagians, on the other side, set their brains to work to find some *actual sin* in an infant. It was to their purpose; for since they took on them to deny *original sin*, and were pressed with that argument most of all, That the reason why infants are baptized is for forgiveness of sin, — they, for an evasion, would sometimes say, That their peevishness and fretful crying, as soon as they are born, is a sin †; and they may be baptized for the forgiveness of that or such like sins. St. Austin explodes that rather more than the other, as being a thing that no body would ever say but to serve an hypothesis: — "That if they would calmly think of it, they would change their opinion; and if they will not (says he) we shall not have so ill an opinion of human sense, as to fear that any body would be persuaded by them." He takes nothing to be plainer than this, That a child, before the use of reason, can have neither actual sin nor actual faith.

Out of St. Austin's Books de Genesi ad literam.

De Genesi ad literam, lib. 10.

St. Austin began and made a good progress in these books on Genesis long before Pelagius began to stir; but other work intervening, he did not finish and publish them till some time after. I do not observe any thing in them that seems to have any respect to the dispute with him. In this tenth book he handles the point of the origin of the human soul, Whether every person's soul be by immediate creation? — or, Whether, as

* Contra Julianum, lib, 6, c. 5, 6, 7.
† August. de Peccatorum Meritis, lib, 1.

the body of a man is derived from the body of his parents, so his soul also be derived from their soul? He recites the arguments on both sides.

He observes (chap. 11) that the derivation of original sin from our first parents, upon all their posterity, is made by many an argument for the propagation of souls as well as bodies. They instanced in infants, concerning whom they argued thus: If we, say they, be derived from Adam, in respect of their bodies only, and not in respect of their souls, we must have a care that we do not, either make God to be the Author of sin (if he put the soul into a body in which it must needs sin) or else suffer it to be believed that there may be some soul, beside our Saviour Christ's which has no need of the Christian grace to free it from sin; "which last is (say they) so contrary to the belief of the church, that parents run with their infants and little ones to procure the grace of holy baptism; in whom, if that bond of sin be loosed, which is of the body only, and not that which is of the soul too, it may well be asked What hurt it would do them, if, at that age, they should die without baptism? — for if this sacrament be for the good of their body, and not of their soul too, they might be baptized after they were dead; but when as we see that the church *universally* observes this, to run with them while they are alive, and to help them while they are alive, lest when they are dead there be nothing to be done that can do them any good, we see not what else can be made of it, but that every infant is of Adam, both as to his body and as to his soul."

Afterward (cap. 13) this argument is carried on thus, "What has the soul of an infant deserved, that it should be ruined in case it go out of the body without the sacrament of Christian baptism, if it has neither committed any sin of its own, nor be from that soul which first sinned in Adam?"

The answer to that is (cap. 14) attempted to this purpose: —

God puts the soul into an ill-disposed body, that, by ruling and keeping under the concupiscence thereof, by

the help of God's grace, it may procure the advantage of being, together with the body, changed into a better state at the resurrection than ever it could have had otherwise, viz. of living for ever with Christ; and to comply with the steps which the body makes by its gradual growth, the soul is at first possessed with a torpor, or incapacity of acting rationally, which does not do it much hurt, because it wears off by degrees as the body grows to perfection, and the soul recovers from it, and arrives, by God's help, at a good degree of spiritual life. "Now before the time that it can live, according to the Spirit, it has need of the sacrament of the Mediator, &c.; for the punishment of original sin is taken away, even in infancy, by his sacrament; and without his help, even a grown man will not keep under the concupiscence of the flesh, &c.; and the infant must be baptized while he is alive, otherwise it will prove a prejudice to his soul that it was linked with sinful flesh; for the soul of an infant having participated with that, cannot be addicted to the things of the Spirit; for that affection does weigh it down, even after it is parted from the body, unless while it is in the body it be expiated by the one sacrifice of the true Priest."

Reply. * 'But how (say one) if the parents take no care to have this done, either through infidelity or negligence?'

Answer. "That may be said as well of grown persons; for they may die suddenly, or they may fall sick in a place where no body will help them to baptism."

Reply. 'But they have sins of their own that need forgiveness; and if they be not forgiven, a man cannot truly say they are punished undeservedly for the things they have by their own will committed in their lifetime; but why shall that soul be deprived of eternal life (in case no body help the infant to baptism) to which the contagion it has received from sinful flesh cannot be imputed, if it be not propagated from the first sinful soul?

* Cap. 15.

—for it was placed in the body, not by any sin, but by nature that ordered it so, and by God that placed it there; and if we say that the want of baptism will do it no hurt, then what good does it do to one that is helped to it, if there be no hurt to one that is not helped?'

"Here (says St. Austin) I confess that I never heard or read what they can answer for their side, who endeavour to maintain by Scripture (as being for their opinion, or as not being against it) that new souls, and not such as are derived from the parents, are put into bodies."

He attempts, in the following chapters, another answer or two for those that held that opinion of the new creation of souls (for himself, it is plain that he inclined most to the opinion of the propagation of them, only he was so modest as not to determine any thing) but they are long, and, as he shews, insufficient.

"One is, That God does not, in his providence, suffer any infant to die unbaptized, but such as he foresaw would have been wicked and impenitent, if they had lived. He shews how absurd it is to think that God condemns persons for sins, which they never did, or thought of; only he foresees they would have done them if they had lived."

At last he comes to this end of his discourse on that subject. Having recited many arguments and answers on each side, he says (cap. 23) "Having treated of this as largely as I could for the time, I should judge the force of the reasons, and of the authorities, to be equal, or almost equal, on both sides, were it not that the opinion of those that think the souls to be derived from the parents has the advantage on the account of the baptism of infants; on which point what answer can be given them, I do not at present conceive. If God shall hereafter teach me any thing, and shall grant me an opportunity to write it, I shall not grudge it to those that are studious of such things; but I now declare beforehand

that the proof concerning infants must not be disregarded, so as that if the truth be on the other side, that should be past over without answering.

"Aut enim de hac re nihil quærendum est, ut sufficiat fidei nostræ scire nos quo pie vivendo venturi sumus, etsi nesciamus unde venerimus; aut si non impudenter æstuat anima rationalis etiam hoc nosse de seipsa, absit pervicacia contendendi, assit diligentia requirendi, humilitas petendi, perseverantia pulsandi; ut si nobis hoc expedire novit qui melius quam nos quid nobis expediat utique novit, det etiam hoc qui novit dare bona data filiis suis; consuetudo tamen matris ecclesiæ in baptizandis parvulis nequaquam spernenda est, neque ullo modo superflua deputanda, nec omnino credenda nisi apostolica esse traditio."

'For either nothing at all is to be enquired of this 'matter [*the origin of the soul*] and it must suffice our 'faith that we know whither we shall go, if we live 'well, without knowing whence we are sprung; or if it 'be no immodest ambition for a reasonable soul to de-'sire to know this also concerning herself, putting 'away all obstinacy of contending, we must use dili-'gence in inquiring, humility in asking, perseverance in 'knocking, that if he who knows better than we what is 'fit for us, do judge this expedient, he would grant this 'also, as he grants good gifts to his children; but the 'custom of our mother, the Church, in baptizing infants 'must not be disregarded, nor be accounted needless, 'nor believed to be other than a tradition [*or order*] of 'the apostles.'

The late bishop of Worcester has restored * the true reading of this place out of three ancient manuscripts at Oxford; for in those last words, *Apostolica esse traditio*, the word *esse* was in the printed editions *esset*; which addition of one letter had wonderfully perverted the sense; for as it stood so, it was to be translated, "Is not to be disregarded, nor to be accounted needless, nor

* Vindication of Bishop Land's Conference, part 1, ch. 4.

to be believed at all, if it were not a tradition of the apostles;" which makes St. Austin go forward and backward, and forward again in the same breath; but this amendment makes it a coherent sentence, agreeable to the scope of the place, and conformable to what St. Austin says in several other places. For example, It is the same phrase with that which I before recited in this chapter, *Non nisi autoritate apostolica traditum rectissime creditur,* — 'Is most 'reasonably believed to be no other than a thing de-'livered [*or ordered*] by the authority of the apos-'tles.' So that though it was not fitting to alter the reading without the authority of some manuscripts, yet, as soon as the alteration is proposed, it presently appears to be the true reading.

The Papists made great use of this place as it stood so printed, to shew that some points of faith (for they make this difference about the time of baptism to concern a point of faith) can be proved only by tradition, and not by Scripture, and consequently that the Scriptures is no complete rule of faith. Archbishop Laud, managing the defence of the Prostestant doctrine to the contrary, says, * "It is true, Bellarmin presses a main place out of St. Austin, and he urges it hard;" meaning this place; but it might have been observed, even before the true reading was discovered, that the words so put together are nonsense; for if St. Austin had said "The doctrine of infant baptism were not to be believed if it were not a tradition of the apostles," it had been sense indeed, and something to their purpose, though not true; but to say "The custom of the church in baptizing infants were not to believed unless it were a tradition of the apostles," is not sense; because the *custom* was seen and not believed; which is another proof that the print was erroneous, and that the foresaid amendment is the true reading.

The Antipædobaptist, on the contrary, served themselves of this place to prove, as by St. Austin's confes-

* Conference, § 15, N. 5.

sion, that the practice of infant baptism depended only on tradition; from whence they concluded that it was not to be received at all; but whosoever reads these two passages of St. Austin that I have been comparing, will see that he does not, by the words *traditum* and *traditio*, mean a doctrine that had been taught by word of mouth only, and had no foundation in the written word. He plainly expresses the contrary in the former place; for he speaks to this purpose, If any one, beside the practice of the universal church, do require divine authority in this matter, — first, That practice having not been ordered by any council, but having been ever in use in the church, it is most reasonable to believe that it must have been ordered by the apostles themselves; — and, secondly, It may be proved from Scripture also, by the analogy that baptism bears to circumcision, &c.

And whereas the Latin phrase runs *Non nisi autoritate apostolica traditum*, — that does not signify that it was established *no other way* than by a verbal order; but that it came not in by any lesser or later authority than that of the apostles, — not by any general council, &c.

It is true, his arguing in that place does suppose, that though it could not have been proved from Scripture, yet if it could be proved to have been ordered by the apostles by word in their lifetime, that ought to have satisfied any one; and so no doubt it ought, provided the proof were clear; but this does not help the argument of the Papists, who would have the consent of the church *at present* to be a sufficient proof of a doctrine; for how hard or how easy soever it was at that time for the church to know certainly the practice of the apostles, by a tradition which needed to be traced back but for 300 years, it is utterly impossible now to trace back a tradition for 1600 years, unless it be recorded in Scripture, or in those ancient writings nigh the time of the apostles; which, I am sure, the Pope's supremacy and worship of images, &c. are not, whatever this that I am writing of be.

Out of St. Austin's Letter to St. Hierom.

Augustini Epist. 28.

This letter was written after the Pelagian opinions began to be talked of. He mentions them there. "For you are," says he, "none of those who now begin to prate new things; and say there is no guilt derived from Adam, which is by baptism forgiven in an infant;" — therefore, the quotations out of it ought not to be placed in this chapter, were it not that here they may be dispatched more briefly, as being exactly to the same purpose as those I last quoted.

St. Austin having, as we see, in his books on Genesis so treated of the origin of the soul, as to leave it in suspense how it is that we came by our souls; and being still thoughtful of that matter, and coming to know that St. Hierom had wrote something on this subject, in his epistle to Marcellinus, and in a piece of his against Rufinus's *Apology*, wherein he had spoke in favour of that opinion, which makes new souls to be created every day by God for every new infant, calling that *the Opinion of the Church*, — and of the other opinion, which supposes the soul to be propagated from the parent, had said "That it was the opinion of Tertullian and Apollinaris, and many of the western Christians, that as the body is generated of the body, so the soul is of the soul, and subsists in a way much like to that of brute creatures." He had a mind to see how St. Hierom could free that opinion (which he seemed to embrace) of the new creation of souls, from the objection that lay against it from the propagation of original sin from father to son; and, therefore, he writes to him, though he lived above a thousand miles off, to desire him to explain that difficulty; and, for fear of provoking him (for he was a hasty man, and St. Austin had felt the sharpness of his style, in an angry fit, before) he writes in a most humble strain, and with great deference to his learning and judgment, condescending in his letter to such a degree, even of submission, as never was usual;

and may seem indecent in a bishop writing to a presbyter, entreating him to instruct and satisfy him in such things as he was ignorant of, that he might be able to instruct others.

He first sets down some things which he knew of himself, that St. Hierom might have the less trouble in satisfying him of the other in which he was to seek. The things that he took for certain concerning the nature of man's soul, were,

1. That the soul is immortal, and does not die when it goes out of the body. This he speaks of as a thing universally known and agreed.

2. That it is not a part of God. Some philosophers had taught that; but it was rejected by all Christians, except some Priscillianists, Manichees, and I know not who.

3. That the soul is immaterial, he says, is a thing not easily to be proved to some people; but for his part he is satisfied that it is. This, I suppose, he says, that he may not seem to come too near Tertullian, whom St. Hierom had mentioned, and who had held that not the soul only, but God also has a body.

4. That the soul is fallen into sin, not by any fault of God, not by any necessity either from God, or from its own primitive nature, but by its own will; and that it cannot recover itself but by the grace of Jesus Christ: that there is in all mankind no soul but wants his redemption.

5. That every soul that departs the body, at what age soever, without the grace of the Mediator, and the sacrament thereof, will be in punishment, and will at the last judgment, receive its body to punishment; but if, after the human generation which is from Adam, it be regenerated in Christ, and belong to his communion, it will have, after the death of the body, rest; and also will receive its body again to glory.

"These are (says he) things that I steadfastly believe concerning the soul. Now, I entreat you, hear the things that I want to know; and do not despise me, lest

he despise you, who, for our sakes, vouchsafed to be despised."

"Quæro ubi contraxerit anima reatum quo trahitur in condemnationem, etiam infantis morte præventi, si ei per sacramentum quo etiam parvuli baptizantur, Christi gratia non subvenerit?"

'I ask where the soul contracted that guilt, by which 'it is brought to condemnation (even the soul of an in-'fant surprized with death) if the grace of Christ do 'not relieve it by the sacrament whereby infants are 'baptized?'

In the process of the letter he takes for granted, that St. Hierom's opinion is, That a soul is new created for every infant; and says, "I am very willing to be of that opinion too; but I am not as yet of it. Therefore, I entreat you, teach me what I shall teach and hold; and tell me, if particular souls be made for every particular infant born, when it is that they do sin in the infant so as to need forgiveness? &c. Since we must neither say of God, that he either forces the souls to become sinful, or punishes them being innocent; nor can deny that those souls, even of infants which depart the body without Christ's sacrament, do go to any other than condemnation. I beseech you, how can that opinion be defended, which holds that the souls do not come all of them from that one soul of the first man? — but that as he had one made for him, so there is a particular one made for each infant."

He then recites some other objections that some people made against this opinion; as that God rested the seventh day from making any new thing; and that God, when he saw an infant begotten in whoredom, would never create a soul for that, &c.; and he says, That he himself could easily answer all those objections; and adds,

"But when I come to the pains suffered by infants, I am, I assure you, brought to great straits, and cannot find any thing at all to answer. I mean, not only

those pains which, after this life, do attend that condemnation to which they must go if they die without the sacrament of the Christian grace, but those which, in this life, we see with our eyes, and it grieves us to see; which, if I should go to count, I should sooner want time than instances. They languish with sickness, they are tortured with pains, they are afflicted with hunger and thirst, maimed in their limbs, deprived of their senses, tormented with unclean spirits." He afterwards asks, "Whether we are to think that, as the herd of swine was given to the Devils to do their pleasure with them, so God hath left infants to their will without a just cause?"

Afterward, in trying every side of this argument, to see if there be any escaping the force of it, he speaks of the necessity there was to believe that infants cannot be saved without Christ; and that they have not the benefits of Christ consigned to them but by baptism; and having mentioned that saying of the apostle, *As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be quickened,* and some other texts, he says,

"And, therefore, whosoever shall tell us that any one can be quickened in the resurrection of the dead, except by Christ, is to be abhorred as the bane of our common faith; and whosoever shall say that infants shall be quickened in Christ, which die without partaking of this sacrament, does both contradict the apostle's preaching, and also (*totam condemnat ecclesiam*) condemns the whole church, in which men do hasten and run with their infants to be baptized, doubtless for that reason, because they believe that otherwise they cannot be quickened in Christ; and he that is not quickened in Christ, must remain in that condemnation of which the apostle speaks, *By one man's offence judgment came on all to condemnation.* To which condemnation that infants are born liable (*et omnis credit ecclesia*) both all the church believes; and you, in your books against Jovinian, and in your *Exposition on the Prophet Jonah,* have most orthodoxly proved, as I

said before; and I suppose in other places of your works, which I have not read, or do not at present remember. — Now I would know What is the cause of this condemnation? — for if new souls be made for every infant, I cannot see any sin of the souls at that age; and I don't believe that God will condemn any which he sees to have no sin."

After another paragraph, in which he quotes a passage out of the letter of St. Cyprian, which I produced before (ch. 6) he says, "There must be a reason given why souls that are new created in all that are born are condemned; for that they are condemned if they so die, both the holy Scripture and the holy church is witness; therefore, this opinion of the creation of new souls, if it do not oppose this most established faith, shall be mine; and if it do, don't let it be yours."

Then he shews the absurdity of those who answer all this, by saying, That the soul sinned in some former state, before it came into the body.

He concludes with protesting, that he could wish that *that* opinion of St. Hierom might be shewn to be true: he liked it so well in other respects, were it not for this objection. He mentions his prayers to God that the doubt in which he was of this matter, might, if it were God's will, be cleared to him by St. Hierom's means; but owns he must have patience if God refuse him this request; and of the several ways of clearing it, says,

"Antequam sciam quænam earum potius eligenda sit, hoc me non temere sentire profiteor, eam quæ vera est non adversari robustissimæ ac fundatissimæ fidei, qua Christi ecclesia nec parvulos homines recentissime natos a damnatione credit, nisi per gratiam nominis Christi quam in suis sacramentis commendavit, posse liberari."

'Before I know which of them is to be chosen, this 'I know, that *that* of them which is the true, does not 'oppose that most firm and established faith, by which 'the church of Christ believes that even the new-born

'little ones of mankind cannot be freed from condem-
'nation, but by the grace of the name of Christ, which
'he has commended to us in his sacraments.'

St. Hierom, in his answer * to this letter, did not think fit to enter upon a discussion of this question of the origin of the soul; but answered in short, That it was better for each to abound in his own sense, than by their disputes of this matter, to give advantage to their common enemies the Pelagians, who said there was no original sin at all. "We (says he) do indeed argue this matter for instruction's sake; but our adversaries, and especially the heretics, when they see us of different opinions, will slander us as if we did it out of envy. Let us rather do our endeavour that *that* most pernicious heresy may be extinguished, which always pretends repentance, that it may have opportunity of teaching in the church, lest, if it should declare itself openly, it should be expelled from thence, and so die."

St. Austin, though he reckoned that, in the other way of explaining the origin of the soul, which was embraced in the western church, viz. that it, as well as the body, is begotten by the parents, it was much more easy to account for the guilt of original sin; yet never was positive. Neither did he publish this letter, as he † says himself, so long as St. Hierom lived, — "Because if he had written any answer, they might be better published together; but when he was dead, I published it (says he) that he that reads it may take advice, either not to make any inquiry at all how the soul is given to those that are born, — or else in so very obscure a matter, to admit of such a solution of the question as is not contrary to those plain points which the Catholic faith owns concerning infants, that they will doubtless be condemned if they be not regenerated in Christ."

The opinion of St. Hierom, That the soul is by immediate creation, has since prevailed to be almost the universal opinion in the west, as well as the east.

---

* Epist. 94. † Retract. lib. 2, c. 45.

But the mechanic philosophy that is lately come in vogue, has set some men upon an attempt to frame an hypothesis about the nature of the soul, which I cannot say is of St. Austin's side; because it carries the matter a great deal farther than he would have it. It makes the soul not to be any thing really distinct from the body; but only such a disposition of the parts of the body, as makes it fit to live, move, remember, think, &c.; all which, they think, may be done by a system of matter, provided there be skill enough in the contriver; and they refer us to the infinite art of God, — so the old definition of Aristotle is come in request again, That it is nothing but *actus corporis organici.*

One may explain their meaning best by a thing that is more obviously apprehended. The disposition of the wheels in a clock, such as will make it go, may, for explication's sake, be called *The Soul of the Clock*; and when the wheels are so rusty or broken that it will no longer go, the soul of it is gone; and a skilful artificer that can mend it, and make it go better than before, gives it a resurrection.

There is in this sense no notion of a soul existing in a separate condition; and, accordingly, these men believe no such thing.

The Antipædobaptists have been much inclined to an opinion of man's soul, that it either dies with the body, and has no existence,— or falls asleep, as some term it, and has no sense till the resurrection. It is an opinion that took footing early among them in Germany; for Calvin, in his work called *Psychopannychia*, written 1534, says, * "Some people in Arabia were the first authors of this opinion, who said The soul died with the body, and rose again at the Day of Judgment; and afterward, John, Bishop of Rome, held it, whom the school [*or academy*] of Paris forced to recant; and after it had been laid to sleep for some ages, it was lately revived by some of the Anabaptist sort." In his

* In Præfatione.

Instructio adversus Anabaptistas, * written 1544, he says, "They all commonly hold, that souls separate from the body do sleep without any sense or understanding till the Day of Judgment; or, that the soul of a man is his life, which ceases when he dies, till he be raised again."

Some of the Antipædobaptists do still hold the same opinion; but not all.

It is a wonder how they, of all people, came to fall into this opinion; for since they do, many of them deny original sin, the other opinion, which the generality of Christians do now embrace (viz. that the soul of each infant is a spiritual substance, anew created by God, capable of existing without a body, but put by him into the body) is much fitter for their purpose; for, as St. Austin here shews, the opinion of original sin derived to us all in our infancy from Adam, our first parent, is much more easy to conceive on a supposal that we have nothing in us but what is propagated from the seed of Adam, than it is upon a supposal that God creates a soul out of nothing, which can subsist of itself, and puts it into the body for a time; — for how comes that soul to have a guilt, derived to it from the sin of Adam, which has no succession at all from Adam, but is now lately created by God? It is indeed put into a body derived from Adam; but sin is of the soul rather than of the body; and besides, it was not its own fault or choice that it was put into a sinful body.

So that the Pædobaptists and Antipædobaptists holding these opinions thus crosswise, do make a controversy which, in this particular, looks something like a dispute † mentioned by St. Chrysostom, that was managed, in his time, between a Christian and a Greek; but so unskilfully, that he says, "The Greek said what the Christian should have said; and the Christian said what the Greek should have said."

It is, however, a requisite property of sincerity, to declare and profess in any point what we think truest,

* Art. 7. † In 1 ad Corinth. Hom. 3.

though the other side do seem to suit better with our other tenets. The contrary, is to serve, not the truth, but our hypothesis.

I am afraid we must all sit down in our disquisition concerning the origin of our souls, content with the comfort with which St. Austin here supports himself, That we know, if we live well, whither we shall go after this state, without knowing how we came into it; for the explication that the schools have since added to this matter, with their *creando infunditur et infundendo creatur*, has put some new words into our mouths, but no new sense into our heads.

I shall here so far trespass upon the proposed method of quoting the passages wherein the Pelagians were concerned, by themselves, as to rehearse here what St. Austin said a great while after on this subject. The Pelagians, in a letter which eighteen bishops of their party wrote and published by common consent, picked out several things that seemed absurd in the doctrine of the Catholics; and, among the rest, this, That they proved the propagation of sin by the propagation of souls; or held them as points that would stand or fall together. St. Austin, in his answer to that part of their letter, says, *

"They add here, to cloud or confound the matter, an unnecessary question of the origin of souls, to the end that, by disturbing things that are plain by the obscurity of other matters, they may seek an opportunity of lying hid; for they say that we maintain the propagation of sin together with the propagation of souls; which, where or when they have heard in the speeches, or read in the books of those that defend the Catholic faith, I know not; for though I do meet with some things written by Catholics on this subject, yet that was before the defence of the truth was undertaken against these men, and not in answer to any thing of theirs; — but this I say, That original sin is so plain by the Scriptures, and that it is forgiven to infants in the

* Lib. 3, contra duas Epist. Pelagian, c. 10.

laver of regeneration, is so confirmed by the antiquity and authority of the Catholic faith, so notorious by the practice of the church, that whatsoever is disputed, enquired, or affirmed of the origin of the soul, if it be contrary to this, cannot be true."

This was his constant tenet, That though he inclined to one side of the question, concerning the origin of the soul, yet he would not have the doctrine of original sin to depend upon that.

There is one thing more observable from these two last passages of St. Austin, viz. That there was no such thing then used as private baptism of children in houses, except in cases of the greatest extremity; and that even sick children were carried to the church, if it were possible; for it is of such that he says, "Men do hasten and run with them to be baptized while they are alive, lest, when they are dead, there be nothing to be done," &c.—it was to the church that they ran, where there were large fonts or baptisteries, in which infants or grown persons might be put into the water; and it has since been decreed in a general council in *Trullo*, can. 54 [591], That baptisms shall not be in private chapels, but in the public church.

This was so generally observed from the time that churches were built, till of late days, that we read of many kings' sons, and kings themselves, converted to the Christian faith, that received their baptism in the church; whereas now-a-days persons of much lower rank take the state upon them to expect it to be brought home to their children though they are well; and there they put a great contempt upon it, by making it a formal ceremony, subservient to their belly-cheer and a drinking-feast, — little regard being given to the holy sacrament, or the prayers used thereat.

In cases of urgent extremity, the antients did indeed baptize anywhere, in the house, in the bed, &c rather than the party should die without it. I mean to give *,

* Part 2, ch. 9.

by and by, several proofs of that; but they never did so but in such cases.

The Church of England allows of baptism by a minister in private houses in cases of necessity; but gives positive order, that it be not used except in case of danger of the child's death; and that such a child, if it live, be brought to the church, and his baptism declared there; and some bishops and curates of the said church do shew a zeal to have this order, which has of late been much neglected, put again in due execution; but others of them seem more indifferent about it; and in most places it is found a difficult thing to overcome that lazy and irreverent custom, which took such deep footing among the people in the late disorderly times.

There never was a more capricious change made by any sort of people in any matter of religion than the English Presbyterians have made in this point. No longer ago than Queen Elizabeth's time, they made it one of their objections against the English *Common Prayer-Book*, that it gave any allowance for this private baptism at all. They pleaded, "That it is not lawful either to preach the word, nor to minister the sacraments in private corners;—that they ought not to be but where the church is; and that the church ought not to assemble (if it be not letted by persecution) but in open places;—that John baptized openly; – that Austin, although he were of that mind, that children could not be saved without baptism, yet, in the Time of Necessity (as it is called) he does not allow either of baptism in private houses, or by women; but when there was danger, the women hasted to carry the children unto the church."

These, and more such like pleas, Cartwright used in his Disputation with Archbishop Whitgift. * "And so you see (says he) those whom you charge slanderously with conventicles, are fain to glaze up the windows that you open to secret and private conventicles;—and hav-

* See Whitgift's Defence of Answer to Admonition, tr. 9, ch. 3, 4, 5. *Item*, tr. 2, ch. 1, div. 8.

ing mentioned "the orders that God has set, that it should be done in the congregation, and by the minister of the gospel," he adds this rigid and Presbyterian expression, "And I will farther say, That although the infants which die without baptizing should be assuredly damned (which is most false) yet ought not the orders which God has set in his church be broken after this sort; for as the salvation of men ought to be dear unto us, — so the glory of God, which consisteth in that his orders be kept, ought to be much more dear."

Whitgift, on the other side, shews, that the book did not say any thing of baptism by women or by laymen: he pleads for no more than this, "That upon extreme necessity of sickness, peril of death, and such like, the curate may be sent for, or some other minister that may sooner be come by," to do it in the house; but he is not allowed that.

How strangely have these men since ran into the other extreme! When they came to have the ordering of matters in the church, they (though contrary to the rules of their own *Directory*) gratified the humour of the people in this matter far more than ever the Church of England had done. If their religion had been parliamentary, as the Papists slander all our religion to be, they could not have taken a more violent swing from one side to the other.

At present, they and their people make this house-baptism the most ordinary way of administering that sacrament, be the child sick or well; and in London and other places, where any of them are, a clergyman of the Church of England cannot, if he would, bring his people to the observation of the foresaid order of the church; because if any humorous man or woman of his parish have a mind to have their child, though in ever so good health, baptized in the house, and he deny them, the next thing is, they, in a pet, send for one of these men, who are always ready to do it.

There are no orders of the church that do come, in process of time, to be more grossly and universally abused than those that begin first to be dispensed with

for the state and character of the persons concerned in them. This was first granted as a privilege of kings, or kings' sons, as appears by the decretals of Clement the Fifth, and by the Council of Cologne, where it is ordained that none but they should be baptized at home. Afterward it came, I suppose, to be allowed to noblemen, and so to other rich men; and as every body affects the name and state of Gentility, they think themselves hardly dealt with, if they be accounted in this matter inferior to such or such of their neighbours.

This, and many other instances of the like nature that might be given, should teach the clergy to take care how they make any beginning of breaking that rule of Scripture given by St. James (ch. ii. ver. 1, 2, 3) against any respect of persons to be shewn in church matters; for if you once begin, there is no stop to be made afterward; therefore, the Synod of Aix * determined [1485], "That no curate or other priest should, under pain of excommunication, go to any house, not even of a nobleman, to administer baptism, except in case of necessity; and that no case should be taken to be of necessity, but when the child's life is in danger.

CHAPTER XVI.

QUOTATIONS OUT OF SOME COUNCILS OF CARTHAGE, BEFORE THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.

[Year after the Apostles 297.]

THE most ancient Councils of Carthage, as well as of other churches, are not recorded in the volumes of councils. The custom of registering the Acts of Councils, and bringing them into volumes, begun later. One of the first of all the Councils of Carthage, and (except one or two) of the most ancient in all Christendom, since the times of the apostles, of which we have any

* Bochell. Decret. Eccl. Gall. de Baptismo, c. 77.

remains, was that of sixty-six bishops under St. Cyprian, in the year after the apostles 150, which resolved the question Whether infant baptism might be administered on the first or second day after the birth, or must be deferred till the eighth? — but the account of that is given before at large in chap. 6. Those that I mean to recite here are of such as are set down in the common volumes, and were about the latter end of the fourth century.

Of these Dr. Cave * and others have observed, that there is great obscurity and difficulty in assigning the very year on which they were held; and some confusion, by reason of the carelessness or mistakes of the collectors, who have sometimes inserted in one council some of the canons that have been made in another. I shall not in these nice matters pretend to be wiser than other men; but the first canon that I shall quote, carries in itself a plain and undoubted indication of the year in which it was enacted.

It is the forty-eighth canon of that Council of Carthage which is generally called *The Third.* About the time when this council was held, the schism of the Donatists began to break apace; and those who had been brought up in it came over in great numbers to the communion of the church. This party of men, as I shewed before (ch. 9) differed nothing from the Catholics in any point, either of doctrine, or of ceremonies, or of sacraments; but only they accounted that party in Africa, which was called *The Catholic Church*, impure, by reason of some ill men that were among them, or by reason that some of the ministers thereof derived their ordination from bishops that had, as was said, been guilty of apostacy in the former times of persecution; and all that came over to them from the Catholics they had been wont to baptize anew, as coming out of an impure church.

Now, the bishops of this council debated among themselves, How far it was expedient to admit any that

* Hist. Lit. part 2, p. 132.

returned from this schism to the church into holy orders? — and as for those who, having been once baptized in the Catholic Church, did, after they came to years, revolt to the Donatists, and were baptized by them, they agreed that such, upon their return to the church, might be admitted to lay communion, but never to bear any office in the church; but the case of those that had been born among the Donatists, and had been in their infancy baptized by them, and after they came to years of discretion disliked the schism, and came over to the church, seemed very different.

Concerning these, they could not come to any resolution at the present; and, therefore, they agreed that the advice of two of the most noted neighbouring churches should be asked in that matter; and they made a canon in these words: —

Concilii Carthag. Tertii Can. 48.

"De Donatistis, placuit ut consulamus fratres et consacerdotes nostros Siricium et Simplicianum, de solis infantibus qui baptizantur penes eosdem, ne [leg. an.] quod suo non fecerunt judicio, cum ad ecclesiam Dei salubri proposito fuerint conversi, parentum illos error impediat, ne provehantur sacri altaris ministri."

'In reference to the Donatists, it is resolved, That 'we do ask the advice of our brethren and fellow-'bishops, Siricius and Simplicianus, concerning those 'only who are in infancy baptized among them, Whe-'ther in that which they have not done by their own 'judgment, the error of their parents shall hinder them, 'that when they, by a wholesome purpose, shall be 'converted to the church of God, they may not be 'promoted to be ministers of the holy altar?'

The collection that is called *Concilium Africanum*, has this same canon, *capitulo* 14. Siricius was at this time Bishop of Rome, and Simplicianus of Milan; — so that, as I said, this canon gives us from itself a clear proof of the year when it was made, viz. *anno Domini*

397 [297], for Simplicianus was not made Bishop of Milan till the beginning of this year, when he came into the room of St. Ambrose, who died then; and in the beginning of the next year Siricius, Bishop of Rome, died.

The answer of these two bishops seems to have been in favour of those concerning whom their opinion was asked; for four years after [301] the Council of Carthage determines the point absolutely, That such persons may, if there be occasion, be promoted to the ministry. The canon, leaving out the digressions, is this:—

Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ, Can. 57.

Aurelius, Bishop of Carthage, speaks in the council, and says,

"Superiori consilio statutum esse mecum recognoscit unanimitas vestra ut hi qui apud Donatistas parvuli baptizati sunt nondum scire valentes erroris eorum interitum, et posteaquam ad ætatem rationis capacem pervenerunt, agnita veritate, &c. Recepti sunt. Sine dubio ad officium clericatus tales esse applicandos, et maxime in tanta rerum necessitate nullus est qui non concedat.

"Quanquam nonnulli ejusdem sectæ clerici cum plebibus atque honoribus suis ad nos transire desiderent, &c. Sed hoc majori fratrum supradictorum considerationi dimittendum censeo. Tantum de his qui infantes baptizati sunt satagimus, et nostræ, si placet, in iisdem ordinandis consentiant voluntati," &c.

'You remember that, in a former council, it was 'resolved that they who were, in their infancy, before 'they were able to understand the mischief of that 'error, baptized among the Donatists; and when they 'came to age of understanding, acknowledging the 'truth, &c. they were received by us. All will grant 'that such may undoubtedly be promoted to church-'offices, especially in times of so great need.

'Some that have been teachers in that sect would 'come over with their congregations, if they might

'have the same places among us, &c.; but this I leave 'to a farther consideration of our brethren, &c. Only 'that they will consent to our determination, that such 'as were baptized by them in infancy, may be admitted 'to orders.'

This shews plainly that the Donatists, as well as Catholics, baptized in infancy, — only those that had been baptized by the church-party, whether in infancy or at full age, they would not receive into their sect, without giving them a new baptism; because they judged baptism, given in an impure church, was void, though it were given in the right form, and to a subject ever so capable; for which the church charged them with the crime of Anabaptism, or rebaptization; and they were about this time reduced, and came over to the church.

There are added in the old copies of the said third Council of Carthage, *anno Domini* 397, some canons, of which it is said, "It is not certain whether they belong properly to the first, or second, or third council." One of them * is for abating to poor people the fees that are usually paid to the minister at the baptizing of a child; but it being accounted by the most learned critics to be of a later date, and to have been crowded in here by Mercator, I shall omit the recital of it.

The next of the Councils of Carthage, in which we find any mention of infant baptism, is that which is vulgarly called *The Fifth*; and was celebrated three years after, viz. *anno Dom.* 400; in which there is a canon that makes provision for the case of such as had been carried away captive in their infancy, into the country of the barbarians; and when they were ransomed, there was none of their friends left alive that could certainly tell whether they had been baptized before their carrying away or not. Such persons, or their surviving friends for them, were in great perplexity and doubt, Whether

* Labbei Concil. Item, Carranza Summa Concil. Carthag. Tertium. Item, Gratian. q. 1.

it were fit that they should be baptized after their ransom? — for if they were baptized before their captivity, then this would be to baptize them twice; which was looked on by all Christians, except the Marcionites, to be a great profanation of the sacrament; and if they were not baptized before, then not to do it now, were to let them die without any baptism at all. The words of the canon are these:—

Concilii Carthaginiensis, Quinti, canon 6.

"Placuit de infantibus quoties non inveniuntur certissimi testes qui eos baptizatos esse sine dubitatione testentur, neque ipsi sunt per ætatem idonei de traditis sibi sacramentis respondere, absque ullo scrupulo eos esse baptizandos; ne ista trepidatio eos faciat sacramentorum purgatione privari. Hinc enim legati Maurorum fratres nostri consuluerunt," &c.

'It is resolved concerning infants of whose having 'been baptized there are no positive witnesses that can 'give certain evidence, and they themselves are not 'capable to give any account of that sacrament having 'been administered to them by reason of their age, 'that such be without any scruple baptized, lest that 'scruple do cause them to go without the cleansing of 'the sacrament; for our brethren that come from the 'Mauritanians have asked our advice on this question, who do ransom many such from the barbarians,' &c.

I set this council at *anno* 400, that is, the year after the apostles 300; and so do all late writers that speak of it set it then, or within a year or two of that time: which I note, because Binius and some other old copies give it a date that may seem at first sight very absurd and inconsistent, worded thus: *Circa tempora Anastasii Papæ, post consulatum Cæsarii et Attici, sexto Kalendas Junii habitum, æra* 438. 'Held about the 'time of Pope Anastasius, after the consulship of 'Cæsarius and Atticus, six days before the kalends of 'June, in the year 438; but the consulship of Cæsa-

'rius and Atticus was in the year 397;' — and Anastasius came into the see *anno* 398, and lived but four years; and Aurelius, whose name is among the bishops that subscribed this council, could not live to 438; but all this is reconciled by taking that *era* 438, not for the year of Christ, but for the year of that *era*, which the Spaniards call *Era Augusti*, reckoned from the time of the senate's confirming the acts of the Triumvirate, which was (as Petavius *Rat. Temp.* part 2, c. 24, shews) just thirty-eight years before the Christian era; so that this, instead of disturbing, does confirm the date of *anno Dom.* 400.

So that Baronius, Spondanus, Dr. Cave, &c. place it *anno* 398; — Justellus and Cardinal Perron, *anno* 401; — Schelstratius this year 400: all in the time of Anastasius; and another thing which confirms its being on one of these years, is the matter of the last canon of it; and yet the different understanding of some words of that canon, cause the difference in placing it of a year or two. The canon is this: "Resolved, That a petition be made to the most renowned emperors, that all reliques of idolatry, not only in images, but in all places, whether groves or trees, be altogether destroyed."

Now all agree, that, on the year 399, was the most general overthrow of the Heathen temples, in all the empire; but especially at Carthage, and in all Africa. St. Austin gives * the account of it, which is very remarkable.

The Heathens had *had* a tradition very common among them, That the Christian religion should last but 365 years, to be reckoned from the beginning of it. They depended upon an oracle for this. The oracle had said, That Peter, the apostle, being a skilful magician, had, by killing and cutting in pieces a child of a year old, and burying the limbs of it with certain magical rites, raised so strong a charm for the success of the Christian religion, that it must now last for so many years as the child was days old; but when that time was expired,

* De Civitate Dei, lib. 18, c. 53, 54.

they should see it presently come to an end; and one may perceive, by St. Austin's words, that the Heathens at that time expected the extirpation of Christianity as confidently as the Papists do now the extirpation of the northern heresy.

St. Austin allows them the latest time they could suppose for the beginning of the Christian religion, viz. the Pentecost, that was next after Christ's death: he shews that 365 years reckoned from that Pentecost, do end in the consulship of Honorius and Eutychianus, which is, in our way of reckoning, the year 398. "Now" says he, "the next year to that being the consulship of Honorius and Manlius Theodorus, when, according to that oracle of Devils, or figment of men, there should have been no such thing as Christian religion in the world, what was done in other countries I had not occasion to enquire; but this I know, that in Carthage, the most noted and eminent city of all Africa, Gaudentius and Jovius, the Emperor Honorius's lieutenants, did, on the 19th of March, pull down the temples of the false gods, and break in pieces their idols. From which time to this present, being almost thirty years, who does not see how much the worship of Christ's name has increased! — especially since many of those are become Christians who were before kept back from the faith by that prophecy, which, now the time is past, they perceive to have been a foolish and idle one."

Baronius thinks that this order of Honorius, for razing the Heathen temples, was given by him, in compliance with that petition made by this Council of Carthage; and if so, the razing being *anno* 399, the council must have been the year before; but others think that the style of the petition supposes the temples, and such public places of idolatry at Carthage, to be destroyed already; and that the bishops desire the emperor to complete that good work, by extirpating all the remains of idolatry practised with images placed in groves, trees, &c.

This latter seems the more probable by the words of the petition; so the council may be supposed to be the

year after the emperor's first order, viz. *anno Christi* 400; but, however, it appears to have been about this time.

There had been, it seems, in some council at Hippo before that time [290], a resolution to the same purpose, viz. That those who had no certain proof of their baptism in infancy, should be, for certainty, baptized now; for there is in Labbe's collection, and in the *Magdeburgenses* *, at the year 397, set down a copy of a synodical letter, dated Cæsario and Attico Coss. wherein they complain, "That those things which had been long ago enacted in the Council of Hippo, had not been so duly put in execution as they ought." They enjoin better execution of them for the future, and to that purpose give a breviat of them, being forty-one in number; the fortieth of which is given thus: — *De his qui nullo testimonio se baptizatos noverunt ut baptizentur.* — 'For those that are not sure, by any evidence, that they 'have been baptized, — that they be now baptized.'

It was not long after these times [340] that Leo the First, Bishop of Rome, had occasion to consider of the same case in a synod at Rome; and he has left an epistle on that subject; which, though it be something later than the period of time which I have proposed to search, Leo being made bishop of that see in the year of Christ 440, yet, it being so particularly relating to this matter, I shall here transcribe so much of it as is to this purpose. It is directed to Neon, Bishop of Ravenna, and is the thirty-seventh among his epistles.

'We have been given to understand by the relation 'of some brethren, that several captives, who were car- 'ried into captivity at that age, which has no firm 'knowledge of any thing, do, now they are restored to 'their liberty and their home, desire the remedy of bap- 'tism: but by reason of the ignorance of their infancy, 'they cannot remember whether or no they have re- 'ceived the sacrament of that mystery before; and

* Cent. 4, c. 9, de Synodis, p. 866.

'that, by reason of this uncertain state of remembrance, 'their souls are brought into danger; for that, under 'pretence of caution, the grace is denied them, *Quæ ideo 'non impenditur quia putatur impensa*; being, there-'fore, not given them, because it is supposed that they 'have had it already.

'When, therefore, the scrupulousness of some bre-'thren did, not without cause, make a doubt of admi-'nistering to such persons the sacrament of our Lord's 'mystery, we did, as I said, at a synodical meeting, 'take this sort of case into our consideration, and set 'ourselves to discuss the point with a careful diligence, 'according to the opinion of every one, that, by the 'judgment of many considering the matter together, 'we might more certainly fix on the truth; and that 'which, by God's guidance, came into my mind, the 'numerous consent of the brethren confirmed.

'We ought then, above all things, to beware that 'while we shew a sort of caution, we do not fall into a 'failure of regenerating their souls; for who would be 'so addicted to his suspicions, as to define a thing to be 'true which, without any full proof, he, by an uncertain 'opinion, surmises to be so?—therefore, when as nei-'ther he that desires the regeneration does remember 'that he was ever baptized, nor any one else can testify 'of his consecration [*or sanctification*] there is no reason 'to think there is any sin in doing this, when neither he 'that is consecrated, nor he that consecrates him, 'acts any thing against his knowledge [*or conscience*]. 'I know indeed that it is an inexcusable fault, when, ac-'cording to the fashion of the heretics, which is con-'demned by the holy fathers, any one is compelled to 'reiterate his baptism, which is once for all given to 'those that are to be regenerated: the apostolic doc-'trine being against such a practice, and teaching us 'that there is but one Godhead in the Trinity, one con-'fession in the faith, and one sacrament of baptism; 'but there is nothing like that to be feared in this case; 'for that cannot be brought within compass of the crime

'of reiteration, of which we are not sure that it has been 'done once.

'And, therefore, when any such case comes before 'you, first examine the matter narrowly, and continue 'your search for a great while (unless the party seems 'to be nigh his end) whether there be no body at all to 'be found that can help out the ignorance of such a 'person that knows not his own condition; and if it ap-'pear that he that wants the sacrament is kept off only 'by a vain surmise, let him come without fear to the ob-'taining of the grace of which he does not find any evi-'dence that he has had it before; and let us not be 'afraid to open the gate of Salvation to him who 'cannot be proved as yet to have entered into it.

'But if it can be proved that any such person has 'been baptized, tho' by the heretics, let the sacrament 'of regeneration be by no means reiterated on him; but 'let that only which was wanting there, be now added, 'that he have the imposition of hands by the bishop, for 'the obtaining the grace of the Holy Spirit.

'These things, dear brother, I was willing should 'come to the knowledge of you all, lest, while you allow 'too much to your scruples, the mercy of God be denied 'to those that desire to be saved.

'Dated the ninth before the kalends of Novem-'ber, in the consulship of Marcian, the emperor.'

The same question being put to him by Rusticus, Bishop of Narbon, he resolves it to the * same effect; and so does Gregory the Great, in the next age [490] †; and so does the council in *Trullo*, can. 84, *anno* 691 [491].

The heretics that Leo talks of, as reiterating baptism, were either the Marcionites, who gave to some people a second or third baptism, though they owned the first to have been true baptism, — or else the Donatists, who thinking no baptism to be true that was not given by such holy and pure men as themselves, gave a

* Epist. 52, cap. 16. † Lib. 12, ep. 31.

new baptism to all that came from any other party to theirs.

The Church of England is very careful, as not to let any one go without baptism, so also not to baptize again those that have been baptized already; and, therefore, when any person is brought to baptism, concerning whom they cannot be sure whether he is already baptized or not, they order him to be baptized with these conditional words preceding the form of baptism, *If thou art not already baptized*, N. *I baptize thee, in the name*, &c.

It had been usual to do so for many hundred years * before [1059]; but Luther found great fault with this custom; and Vossius dislikes it, but gives no other reason against it than that there is no example of such conditional baptism in Scripture, nor in the records of the first ages; which, in a case that so seldom happens, is no wonder; for in the Church of England, where it is appointed in a certain case, yet, that case being rare, very few have ever had occasion to practise it; but it is certain that all that do baptize in such a case, do understand that condition, though they do not express it; for they do it on a supposal that the party is not baptized already.

The next Council of Carthage that I know of that had any occasion to mention infant baptism, was that *anno* 411 [311], or the beginning of 412, where Celestius was challenged for denying original sin, and thought to escape the brand of heresy by declaring, that whatever he thought of sin in infants, yet he owned their baptism. This council is not in the volumes; but St. Austin has preserved some of the acts of it, by quoting them in his writings; and I had occasion to recite out of him what is material to this purpose in chapter 5.

The next to that was that *anno* 416 [316]: a synodical letter whereof I shall recite hereafter, in ch. 19.

---

* Vide Vossium de Baptismo, Disp. 15, art. 11, et lib. 6, capit. Car. Magni.

CHAPTER XVII.

OUT OF THE DECRETAL EPISTLES OF SIRICIUS AND INNOCENTIUS, BISHOPS OF ROME,

[Year after the Apostles 284.]

THERE never was a greater cheat and abuse put upon the church and the learned world, than that piece of forgery of the most ancient *Decretal Epistles*. The Papists themselves are now ashamed to hear them mentioned, except some few, whose want of all shame makes amends for their want of learning.

The history of them, in short, is this:—The ancient bishops of Rome were frequently consulted by the country bishops and the bishops of the neighbouring churches, in cases of conscience, faith, or discipline. They wrote letters in answer to such questions as were put to them. Toward the latter end of the fourth century there began a custom of registering and preserving these letters in the archives of that church. This was in the following times found to be of great use; for these letters served the succeeding bishops for precedents, when their judgment was desired in the like cases.

After many ages, it came into the mind of some of that church, to think how great pity it was that *that* custom of registering those letters had not began sooner; for there were none extant in the registers that were earlier than about the time I mentioned.

The way that they took to make up that deficiency was such, as that the mention thereof must make a Christian blush, whenever credit of his religion is attacked by a heathen. Some among them, that had no regard to true or false, put in practice that foul artifice that is used by faithless and fabulous historians, who, when they would set forth the antiquities of their nation, and find no records nor race of kings so ancient as they could wish, do make, out of their own brain, histories of times, names of kings, accounts of wars and successions,

as far back as they please to feign; of which we see instances in the fabulous histories of the Romans, Britons, Scots, Ægyptians, Chinese, &c. This is scandalous, and hateful enough in secular histories; but in the concerns of religion, is the highest pitch of impiety and mischief.

Finding that their bishops of the first ages had none of these decretal epistles upon record, as many of the following ones had, they made some for them, and put them out under their names; and as there was a very corrupt state of that church at the time when these acts were forged, the authors of them failed not to make the ancient Popes say all that they had a mind they should have said; so that you shall there frequently find some bishop of Rome, of the primitive times, who was in reality an humble, poor, and persecuted bishop, strutting and vapouring about the supremacy of his see, and enacting many things that were really never heard in his time.

When any thing is discovered and made plain, we are apt to wonder that it was not discovered sooner. It was a time of great ignorance and barbarity when these forged epistles were put upon the world; and in the beginning of the Reformation, the Protestants were much puzzled with them. They saw plain enough that the corrupt doctrines and practices then received had no foundation in the Scripture, nor in the writings of the ancient Christians for several ages; but they knew not what to say to these epistles, many of which were dated in and nigh the times of the apostles, and yet had in them rank Popery. Those first bishops of all, Clement, Anaclet, Evarest, Alexander, Xystus, and the holy martyr Telesphorus, &c. did there all speak the language of Gregory the Seventh.

It is true that here and there one of the best learned and most free men among the Papists themselves, had before that time declared their objections against some of these epistles; for example, Cardinal Cusanus, after he had shewn by plain proofs that the Charter of Con-

stantine's Donation was a forgery [1334], adds,* "As, perhaps, are some other of the large writings attributed to St. Clement and Anaclet; for the letters themselves, examined by the circumstances of the times of those men, do betray themselves;"— but these exceptions of one or two men availed nothing against the general vote; they were universally received, the canonists make constant use of them, and the canon law of that time was in great measure, made out of them. Wickliff ventured to say that they were apocryphal [or spurious]; and that the clergy were fools to study them; which is reckoned for the thirty-eighth of the forty-five heresies, for which he was condemned by the council of Constance.

Luther exclaimed against them after his way [1417]; and caused them and the whole body of the decretals to be publicly burnt; but he had not learning enough to trace and descry the forgery of them; but Bishop Jewel being to answer his adversary Harding, who had pressed him with authorities out of them [1456], made use of his skill in ecclesiastical history to disclose plain proofs of forgery in several of them; and the critics since, both those of the Romish and Reformed Church, have, by a particular examination, put it out of doubt, that all of them beyond the times I spoke of are spurious.

They are never mentioned by any writer of any antiquity; they are written, not in the style that was in use in the time of the Roman Empire, but in that of the barbarous age. The dates of almost all of them are inconsistent with history. The ignorant forger has made most of them speak of men and things, customs and forms, that were not in being at that time; beside, that each epistle has in itself some particular proof of its being forged.

Now that which the critics and learned men are agreed on is, that the epistles of Pope Siricius, who was made bishop, *anno* 384, are the first of all the decretal epistles that are genuine, *i. e.* that were really written by the men whose name they bear. It is true

* De Concordia Catholica, lib. 3, c. 2.

that there are epistles extant, out of Clement, out of which I gave a quotation (ch. 1); and some of Cornelius, and one or two more, which are undoubted, and are mentioned and valued by all the antients; but the forger of the decretals took no notice of them, either because they were nothing for his turn, or, perhaps, he was so ignorant as not to know of them. Those which he has made, are of more use to the design of the court of Rome, but otherwise of no worth.

Indeed, the Church of Rome affords in all but a very few writers of any antiquity; and if she be the mother, she was in those times outdone by many of her daughters, for number of learned men. Since Clement and Hermas, who lived in the apostles time, and St. Hierom, who had his education in that church, there has been none that I have had occasion to mention in this tract, till this Siricius.

He has several epistles extant that are genuine, and are mentioned by writers so ancient and so learned as not to be imposed on by the forementioned forgery; and the marks of Popish worship, that are so frequent in the elder forged epistles, are all vanished again in those of Siricius and Innocent, and of several Popes that succeeded them. That which I have occasion to quote is the first of them, which is written to Himerius, Bishop of Arragon, in Spain.

He gives him several directions about ecclesiastical matters; and finds fault with many things that, by his information, he understood to be managed disorderly in that church. It is divided into fifteen chapters or paragraphs, whereof the second is this: —

"*Siricii Episcopi Decretalis Epistola Prima.*
"*Capitulo Secundo.*

"Sequitur de diversis baptizandorum temporibus, prout unicuique libitum fuerit, improbabilis et emendanda confusio, quæ a nostris consacerdotibus (quod commoti dicimus) non ratione autoritatis alicujus, sed sola temeritate præsumitur. Ut passim ac libere Natalitiis

Christi, seu apparitionis nec non et apostolorum seu martyrum festivitatibus, innumeræ (ut asseris) plebes baptismi mysterium consequantur. Cum hoc sibi privilegium et apud nos et apud omnes ecclesias dominicum specialiter cum Pentecoste sua Pascha defendat. Quibus solis per annum diebus ad fidem confluentibus generalia baptismatis tradi convenit sacramenta. His duntaxat electis qui ante quadraginta vel eo amplius dies nomen dederint, exorcismis quotidianisque orationibus atque jejuniis fuerint expiati, quatenus apostolica illa impleatur præceptio, ut expurgato fermento veteri nova incipiat esse conspersio.

"Sicut ergo Paschalem reverentiam in nullo dicimus esse minuendam, ita infantibus qui necdum loqui potuerint per ætatem, vel his quibus in qualibet necessitate opus fuerit sacra unda baptismatis, omni volumus celeritate succurri; ne ad nostrarum perniciem tendat animarum, si negato desiderantibus fonte salutari, exiens unusquisque de seculo et regnum perdat et vitam.

"Quicunque etiam discrimen naufragii, hostilitatis incursum, obsidionis ambiguum vel cujuslibet corporalis ægritudinis desperationes inciderint, et sibi unico credulitatis auxilio poposcerint subveniri, eodem quo poscunt momento temporis expetitæ regenerationis præmia consequantur."

'There is also a blameable disorder which ought to 'be amended in baptizing, at various times, as every 'one fancies, which our fellow-bishops among you do 'venture to practise, as I am somewhat vexed to hear, 'not by the rule of any authority, but by mere rash-'ness; so that great numbers of people do, as you say, 'receive their baptism, some at Christmas, some at the 'Epiphany, and some on the holydays of the apostles 'and martyrs; whereas, not only in our church, but in 'all churches, our Lord's Passover [viz. *Easter*] toge-'ther with its Pentecost, does peculiarly challenge this 'privilege to itself. On which days of the year alone 'it is fitting that the common sacraments of baptism 'should be given to those that come to the faith; and

'that those only should be admitted who have given in 'their names forty days or more before, and have been 'cleansed by exorcisms [*or renunciations of the Devil* '*and wickedness*] and daily prayers and fastings, to the 'end that *that* precept of the apostle may be fulfilled of '*purging out the old leaven, that there may be a new* '*lump*.

'As, therefore, I affirm that the respect due to the 'feast of Easter ought by no means to be diminished, '— so my meaning is, that as for infants, who, by rea-'son of their age, are not yet able to speak, and others 'that are in any case of necessity, they ought to be re-'lieved with all speed possible, lest it turn to the per-'dition of our own souls, if we deny the water of sal-'vation to any one that stands in need, and they de-'parting this life, do lose their kingdom and their life.

'Whoever also shall be in danger of shipwreck, or 'of the assaults of enemies, or of a siege, or shall be 'likely to die of any bodily sickness, and shall desire 'to be assisted with that which is the only armour of 'our faith [*or religion*] that they have the gift of rege-'neration which they desire, that same moment that 'they desire it.'

I have set down this the more at large, because we see by it, that at the same time when they insist upon those preparations, and personal qualifications of the adult, they do except the case of infants. It is common for some Antipædobaptist writers to quote such passages as the forepart of this, taken by itself would be, as testimonies that such authors allowed no baptism of infants, because they require those preparatory exercises of all that are to be baptized. This I have seen done a hundred times, when the same author that is quoted does sometimes in the same treatise as here, and sometimes in other parts of his works, shew that infants are to be baptized, as being in a case that is exempt from the general rule that requires faith, prayer, repentance, and other personal preparation. It is no wonder that they do thus with other books, when they can hardly forbear doing it with the Catechism of the Church of England,

which requires repentance and faith of persons to be baptized, but shews by the next words that the case of infants is an exempt case. This practice, though not always so palpable, yet is in effect always as unfair as that with which Wills charges Danvers *, viz. for quoting the canon of a certain council as enacting That none should receive baptism without rehearsing the Creed and Lord's Prayer, and stopping there; when the next words are, Except those who, by reason of age, cannot yet speak.

That which Siricius here says, that it was the custom of the Church of Rome, and of all other churches, to give baptism only at Easter and Whitsuntide, excepting infants, sick people, and other such extraordinary cases, may be proved from a great many other authors. I shall mention no more but Tertullian for his antiquity; he says, † "The most solemn time for baptism is Easter, at which time the passion of our Lord, into which we are baptized, was performed: after that the Pentecost affords a large time for ordering the lavers; but yet every day is the Lord's. Any hour, any time whatever, is capable to be made use of for baptism; though there be some difference as to the solemnity, there is none as to the grace given.

I said that this epistle appears to be genuine and not forged, among the others of the foregoing Popes, by the mention that is made of it by authors so ancient and so learned as not to be imposed on by that forgery. This very passage of it is quoted by Hincmarus Rhemensis ‡ *anno* 835, and by the Council of Tribur § *anno* 895; and I suppose other parts of it may have been quoted by earlier writers, which I have not had occasion to observe. The pretended Isidore, out of whose shop the forged collection of epistles is supposed first to have come, lived about these times, and seems to have been cotemporary with Hincmarus, but something the elder;

* Appeal to Baptists against H. D. chap. 1.
† De Baptismo, c. 19. ‡ Opusculo. 55. Capitulorum, cap. 81
§ Can. 12.

but as all forged works do require some time after their first hatching to be known, or at least to gain any authority, there is no likelihood that such learned men (as Hincmarus especially was) should quote any thing upon a dependence on so fresh an impostor; especially when neither he nor the council do quote it as from Isidore, but as an epistle generally known in the world: and besides, the learned critics, Quesnellus, Du Pin, &c. that do question one of Siricius's epistles as being to be suspected of forgery for reasons they give, do make no question of this.

By the said quotations of Hincmarus and Concill Triburiens, [790] it also appears that the custom of limiting the baptism of adult persons to Easter, and the times aforesaid, continued in the church till their time, and it did continue something longer: but of later times we hear no more of it; I suppose, because the baptisms of adult persons grew to be very few, the Heathen nations being now become Christian, and hardly any but infants being baptized which were not contained in that rule; for it was but about 300 years after this time 890, that Petrus Cluniacensis, writing against some that at that time, *anno Dom.* 1130, set up a doctrine that baptism given to an infant is no baptism, opposed to them this, among other things, That if it were so then [1030] whereas all Europe has had never a person now for 300, or hardly any for 500 years, baptized otherwise than in infancy, it has had never a Christian in it. The place I quote more largely hereafter *.

This order of the ancient church, that no adult person, except in case of necessity, should be baptized but at these set and appointed times, was made for a very good and weighty reason, viz. because there was not so much care likely to be taken of his instruction and examination if he was baptized at some other time of the year alone by himself, as there was if he was baptized at Easter when the other *catechumeni* were baptized:

* Part 2, ch. vii.

because, for some weeks before Easter, the ministers of the church made it their business to catechize, examine, and prepare the candidates for baptism: they were to give in their names forty days before; and they were to be able to repeat the Creed, &c. and to give account of their faith twenty days before (something more or less, according to the canons of the several churches) and the people came together to hear these examinations and professions; and care was taken that they did spend the time in prayers, fastings, and such other holy exercises as would fit them for so great a change of their state: and, because there were at Easter a great number of them, and the spiritual good of the church did in great measure depend upon their doing well, it was counted an occasion weighty enough to require that the whole church should at that time pray and fast with them, and for them, as I quoted out of Justin Martyr:* "They are directed to pray, and ask of God with fasting the forgiveness of their former sins; and we also pray and fast together with them." And this I believe was none of the least occasions of keeping the fast of Lent before Easter.

We see also to this day some remains of the catechizing used then; for though the Church of England do now appoint catechizing all the year long, yet most of the curates therein omit it all the year, except the time of Lent, but at that time that office is by old custom kept on foot; it was to prepare the candidates for baptism at Easter that the Lent catechizing was used.

Also in the Liturgy of the same church, and in that of the Church of Rome, the Collect for the third Sunday after Easter remains in that form; which seems to have been composed at first with a particular respect to the new baptized persons. *Almighty God, who shewest to them that be in error the light of thy truth, to the intent that they may return into the way of righteousness; grant unto all them that are admitted into the fellowship of Christ's religion, that they may*

* Ch. ii.

eschew those things that are contrary to their profession, and follow all such things as are agreeable to the same, through our Lord Jesus Christ. This is a good prayer at all times, and for all persons; but I believe the first composing it for that Sunday was in regard to the Neophytes. The Collects for Easter, and the two Sundays following, referring to the resurrection, the next was for them.

The 9th chapter, or canon, of the same epistle of Siricius is, to blame the people of Spain for choosing into the ministry some such as had been but lately converted to the Christian religion; and he gives them this direction: —

"Quicunque igitur se ecclesiæ vovit [l. vovet] obsequiis, a sua infantia ante pubertatis annos baptizari, et lectorum debet ministerio sociari."

'He that devotes himself to the service of the church, 'ought to be baptized [*i. e. ought to be one that was* '*baptized*] in his infancy, before ripeness of age, and 'employed in the office of the readers.'

This rule was a little after repeated to the people of Spain by Innocentius, in words just to the same purpose, only a little plainer, which I shall recite presently.

After Siricius, Anastasius sat but about three or four years, and was succeeded by Innocentius the First. He must have been a man of note in the church before the year 400; for it was in the year 402 that he was made bishop of Rome. He also has some decretal epistles (besides those to the Council of Carthage, which I shall cite hereafter) that mention infant baptism, and are by all acknowledged to be genuine.

His first is written to Decentius, bishop of Eugubium, giving him his resolution in several things wherein he had demanded it: whereof the third is, that though the presbyters might baptize infants, yet only bishops might give them the chrism, or anointing on the fore-

head, which was in those times given after baptism; it is as follows:—

Epistola Decretalis Innocentii ad Decentium, Can. 3.

"De consignandis vero infantibus, manifestum est non ab alto quam episcopo fieri licere. Nam presbyteri, licet sint sacerdotes, pontificatus tamen apicem non habent. Hæc autem pontificibus solis deberi, ut vel consignent vel paracletum Spiritum tradant, non solum consuetudo ecclesiastica demonstrat, verum et illa lectio Actuum Apostolorum, quæ asserit Petrum et Joannem esse directos qui jam baptizatis traderent Spiritum Sanctum. Nam presbyteris seu extra episcopum seu præsente episcopo cum baptizant, chrismate baptizatos ungere licet, sed quod ab episcopo fuerit consecratum; non tamen frontem ex eodem oleo signare, quod solis debetur episcopis," &c.

'As for the anointing of infants on the forehead with the chrism, it is plain that *that* ought to be done by none but the bishop; for presbyters, though they be as priests, yet they have not the pre-eminence of the chief priests: and that it is lawful for the chief priests only, either to anoint on the forehead, or give the Holy Spirit, as appears not only by the custom of the church, but also by that place in the Acts of the Apostles, which tells * us that Peter and John were sent to give the Holy Spirit to such as were already baptized; for when presbyters do give baptism either in the presence of the bishop, or out of his presence, they may anoint the baptized person with chrism, provided it be such as has been consecrated by the bishop; but they must not anoint the forehead with the same, for that is peculiar to the bishops,' &c.

Though this place do not mention the baptism of these infants, yet it plainly supposes it: the chrism was never given to any till they were baptized.

* Acts viii. 14.

The rule that he sets here, That none but the bishop must give the chrism on the forehead, was the ordinary and general rule of that church; but yet dispensed with in the case of want of bishops, or their default of doing their office, as I shew hereafter *.

The other passages of Innocentius, which is to the same effect with that which I recited from Siricius, is in his 24th epistle, which was written to a synod then met at Toledo; whereof the 5th chapter is a rule given for the qualifications of such as were to be admitted to the ministry. He had determined in the foregoing canons, that no lawyer, soldier, or officer of the temporal court, should be received to holy orders; and then gives the qualifications following: —

"*Epistolæ Innocentii Primi ad Synodum Toletanam,*
"*Can. Quintus.*

"Quales vero eligendi sunt in ordine clericorum evidens forma declarat, *i. e.* qui ab ineunte ætate baptizati fuerint, et lectorum officio sociati, vel si majores sunt cum fuerint Dei gratiam consecuti, statim se ecclesiasticis ordinibus mancipaverint."

'And as to the qualifications of such as are to be 'chosen into the ministry, there is a certain rule, viz. 'That they be such as have been baptized from their 'infancy, and have been educated in the office of 'readers: or, if they were older before they obtained 'the grace of God, then that they be such as did pre-'sently upon it addict themselves to offices of the 'church.'

It has been often enough said already, That there were in those times, besides those that were baptized in infancy, several that turned from Heathenism to Christianity at their ripe age: such the canon would not have to be put into holy orders, but only such as were baptized in infancy, unless those so converted have, from

* Part 2, ch. ix.

their first coming to the faith, addicted themselves to the service of the church in the lower offices; to prevent the inconvenience mentioned by St. Paul, in preferring novices* or Neophytes, *i. e.* persons but lately baptized or made Christians.

CHAPTER XVIII.

OUT OF PAULINUS, BISHOP OF NOLA, AND ANOTHER PAULINUS, DEACON OF THE CHURCH OF MILAN.

[Year after the Apostles 293.]

PAULINUS, Bishop of Nola, had been a Heathen man; during which time he had addicted his mind to poetry and oratory. After he became a Christian he made use of those faculties on religious subjects; and Sulpitius Severus, who had built a church, desired him to compose some proper godly sentences, to be written in several places of the church, and particularly at the font, or place of baptizing. Paulinus sends him a letter in answer, containing several such sentences. It is

Epist. 32. Quæ est duodecima ex iis quæ sunt ad Severum.

In one of them, composed in verse for the font, there is this distich: —

> *"Inde parens sacro ducit de fonte sacerdos*
> *Infantes niveos corpore, corde, habitu."*

> 'The priest from the holy font does infants bring,
> 'In body, in soul, in garments white and clean.'

As he refers to the cleanness of the body, by washing in the font, and of the soul, on account of the forgiveness of sins granted in that holy sacrament, so what he

---

* 1 Tim. iii. 6.

speaks of the whiteness of their garments, is according to the custom then used all over the church of clothing the new baptized person, whether infants or grown people, in *albes*, or white garments.

If there were not testimonies enough of the custom of baptizing infants in this age, this alone would not be sufficient to prove it; for there being nothing but the word *infants* singly mentioned, without any other circumstances setting forth their age, — and there being a custom about these times of calling, by a metaphorical speech, all the new baptized persons *infants*, whether they were young or old, — it is a question whether Paulinus did, by that word, intend to restrain the sense to infants in age, or whether he meant only to describe the procession of the priest, leading from the font a number of newly baptized persons in general in their *albes*.

That there was such a custom of calling new baptized persons by the name of *Infants*, about this time, appears by several instances. Gaudentius, who was Bishop of Brescia about this time, has an oration or sermon *, in which he thus bespeaks the novices, or new baptized persons:—"You are put in mind by the name of *Infants*, by which you are called, that you are, by your baptism regenerated and born anew; and, therefore, if any of you that are married," &c. Also St. Austin has a sermon or discourse, intitled *Ad Infantes*, — 'To the Infants,' *i. e.* to a congregation of persons then newly baptized; and I confess it seems to me that *that* passage of St. Ambrose (*De Mysterio Paschæ*, c. 5), which Mr. Bingham (vol. iv. p. 24) takes to be spoken of proper infants, is rather to be referred hither. He is there speaking of the holy Christian rites used at the feast of Easter; particularly the baptismal solemnities, and says, "Hinc vitalis lavacri sacræ ecclesiæ editi puerperio infantes parvulorum simplicitate renati, baratro innocentis perstrepunt conscientiæ. Hinc casti patres pudicæ etiam matres, novellam per fidem stirpem prose-

* Orat. 8, ad Neophytos.

quuntur innagneram." 'Here the infants brought forth 'of the womb of the vital laver of the holy church, be-'ing regenerated in the simplicity of babes, do sing from 'the bottom of a sinless conscience. Here chaste fa-'thers and mothers do follow great numbers of their 'children new-born by faith.' — He means, I think, the Godfathers following the new baptized persons, whom they had brought to baptism; and who walked from the font in procession in their *albes*.

This does not at all invalidate the testimonies which have been given for infant baptism; for, in all that I have quoted, except this and one or two more, there is, beside the word *infant*, some circumstance that does shew the speech to be about infants in age. It rather confirms the thing, and is itself a testimony; for one reason of the name was, that the number of Christians being now much encreased, and the baptism of Christian infants being more frequent than of elder persons new converted, these latter had the name of *Infants*, in allusion to the former.

Paulinus de Obitu Celsi, Pueri.

'ON THE DEATH OF CELSUS, A CHILD.'

This Celsus was a child very dear to his parents, that died at seven years old, or when he was newly entered into his eighth, as appears by some passages of the discourse. His parents were so overmuch concerned at his death, that Paulinus found it necessary to write to them a consolatory advice. It is written in verse; and, after the first distich, follow these two: —

"Quem Dominus tanto cumulavit munere Christus,
Ut rudis ille ætatis, et novus iret aquis;
Atque bis infantem, spatio ævi, et fonte lavaret,
Congeminata Deo gratia perveheret."

'So great a favour Christ did to him show,
'That he, escaping all the snares below,
'Should hence so young, and fresh from baptism go.
'Two graces do his infant soul commend,
'So little sully'd, and so lately clean'd.'

This quotation is not fully to the purpose either of the Pædobaptists or Antipædobaptists; for the one will enquire Why this child's baptism was delayed so long as till he was almost seven years old? — and the other, Why he was baptized so soon? — and there is not any such account of the condition of his parents as to satisfy either of them. They might, perhaps, be, as Paulinus himself was, lately converted, or it might be deferred by negligence and procrastination. St. Austin somewhere, but I have forgot where, speaks of fourteen years as the soonest that people were *ordinarily* baptized on their own profession; yet, at another place, where his adversary would prove that unbaptized children might go to Heaven, by the instance of Dinocrates, a boy born of Heathen parents and dying at seven years old, whose soul was said, in a certain story-book, to have been seen in Heaven in a vision, by his sister, in her prayers, he says "It is not impossible but that at that age he might have been baptized at his own choice;" which place I have occasion to recite hereafter *.

It is plain enough by what has been said, that the ordinary time of baptizing infants was within a little time after their birth; and the Antipædobaptists, I suppose, do not think a child of seven years old any fitter than a mere infant.

The custom that I mentioned, of calling new baptized persons by the name of *Infants*, is alluded to here; for Paulinus calls this child *his infantem*, in two respects an infant, viz. *spatio evi et fonte lavacri*; 'an 'infant in age, and an infant as newly baptized.'

Paulinus has some letters and tracts attributed to him that are spurious; but this is recited among his works, by Geanadius, in these words: — † "Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, in Campania, wrote many things in way of short poems; and a consolatory tract to Celsus, in form of an Epitaph, on the death of his Christian and baptized infant, full of Christian hope," &c.

* Ch. 20. † Catalog. Virorum Illustrium.

Paulini Epistola ad Hieronymum de duabas Quæstionibus apud Hieronym. Ep. 153.

Paulinus, in this letter, desired St. Hierom's opinion of the meaning of two sayings which the Scripture uses.

One was, what is said in Exod. ix. 12: He asks, *Why* [or in what sense] *Pharaoh's heart was hardened by God?* — and also, How that which the apostle says (Rom. ix. 16) is to be understood, *It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy;* which seems to take away free-will.

The other was concerning that text (1 Cor. vii.) *Else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.* On which Paulinus asks this question, —

"Quomodo sancti sint qui de fidelibus, id est, de baptizatis nascuntur; cum sine dono gratiæ postea acceptæ et custoditæ salvi esse non possunt?"

'How those children that are born of *fidele*, that is, 'of baptized parents, are holy; whenas, without the 'gift of the grace [*of baptism*] afterward [*viz. after 'their birth*] received and preserved, they cannot be 'saved?'

He seems, at this place, to have taken the obvious sense of St. Paul's words to be, that the infants of Christian parents are holy from their birth; and desires to know what holiness this is that St. Paul ascribes to them from their birth, since, though the parents be baptized Christians, yet, unless the children also be themselves baptized, they cannot be saved.

This is the most material of the evidences we have from him on this subject; for if it be concluded, as he does here conclude, that infants cannot be saved without baptism, it will undoubtedly follow in any one's sense, that they ought to be baptized without delay.

This letter of Paulinus is not extant, that I know of, and perhaps was never published; but St. Hierom, in

his answer to it, which is his epist. 153, *ad Paulinum*, recites out of it what I have here set down.

He makes his answer very short; and that for two reasons, which he gives. One was, That by every ship that sailed for the west, he had so many letters of this nature to send, that he could not bestow pains on any one; but was forced to write whatever came *extempore* into his mind. The other was, That to so great a critic as Paulinus, he did not dare write a long letter, in which the more faults would be found.

It shews us, by the way, how diligent people were at that time in seeking to have the true sense of Scripture; and of how great repute St. Hierom's learning was, when Paulinus and so many others, sent letters a thousand miles to him to desire his opinion.

St. Hierom refers him, for an answer to his first question, to Origen's book, περὶ ἀρχῶν, which he had then newly translated into Latin, and whereof he might have a copy in Pammachius's hands, to whom he had dedicated and sent it; and for the second, his answer is this, —

"Of your second question Tertullian has discoursed in his book *de Monogamia* [leg. *de Anima*] holding that the children of Christians are styled *holy*, as being candidates [*or expectants*] of the faith, and not polluted with any idolatrous filth or trumpery.

"Also you may mind that we read of the vessels of the tabernacle being called *holy*, and many other utensils of the ceremonies; whereas nothing can be properly *holy* but what has sense, and fears God. It is, therefore, a phrase of Scripture sometimes to call those *holy* that are clean and purified, or expiated from uncleanness, as Bathsheba is said to be *sanctified* [*or made holy*] from her uncleanness.

"I entreat you not to impute to me either trifling or wrong interpretation; for God is witness to my conscience, that the hurry I have mentioned to you has hindered me from so much as setting on, or attempting the

interpretation of the place; and you know nothing is done to any purpose in a hurry."

St. Hierom had some reason to make an apology for so slight and perfunctory an explication; yet, as it is, it shews that he, as well as Paulinus, thought that such children could not be called *holy* in any such sense as should entitle them to salvation, unless they were baptized. If he had thought they could, the ready way to take off Paulinus's doubt, had been to answer so,— the doubt being this, How they are holy from their birth, since, without baptism, they cannot be saved? But he answers,

1. By referring him to Tertullian's account of this place in his book *de Anima*, which I recited before *, where he paraphrases the text in this sense, "They are holy, that is, they are designed for holiness; for, as for any other meaning, our Lord has determined, that without baptism none shall enter into the kingdom of God †; which is as much as to say None shall be holy.

2. By giving some instances where the word *holy* is applied to some things that are not capable of salvation, or of moral good or evil.

Calvin, and many that have followed him, have boldly ventured on that explication which Paulinus durst not embrace, nor St. Hierom advise, and which Tertullian disproves. They have determined that a believer's child is holy, *i. e.* is born to salvation (or as a certain late commentator, supposed to be Mr. Lock, has absurdly paraphrased that place, "born a member of the Christian church") whether it be baptized or not; that baptism is to be given it indeed, but only as a seal of that holiness, which it has by covenant before it be baptized; and to this purpose they expound that text (John iii. 5) of any thing rather than of baptism; and many of them have determined that the authority of baptizing infants is grounded only on that birth-privilege which they have

* Ch. 4. † John iii. 5.

before; and that no other infants than such as are so holy by their birth, may, or ought to be baptized; which doctrine involves the baptizer in endless scruples which infants he may baptize, and which not; as Bishop Stillingfleet has largely shewn in the book to which I referred before *.

He that has read the foregoing chapters, is by this time satisfied that all the antients understood our Saviour's words (John iii. 5) of baptism, or will be, by what I shall produce †; and that they never refused to baptize a child on account of the parents wickedness, or even Heathenism or infidelity, if the child were offered to baptism by such as were the then owners of the child ‡.

Much less do the explications given by the antients of the holiness here spoken of, fit or square to that *jejune* one given by some Antipædobaptists, that St. Paul should mean no more but that the children of believers, though one of the parents do continue in unbelief, are legitimate, and not bastards; which looks as made merely to serve a turn.

On the contrary, the general vein of ancient interpretation is, to understand by this holiness baptismal holiness, either as given or designed to be given; as has appeared partly by this quotation, and by some others given before § and will more fully hereafter, where I mean to confer together all the ancient expositions of this text that I know of ‖.

Paulinus in Vita Ambrosii.

[Year after the Apostles 297.]

The other Paulinus was a deacon of the Church of Milan, that ministered to St. Ambrose in his lifetime, and, after he was dead, wrote the history of his life, which is commonly printed with his works. Erasmus takes this piece for a forgery ¶ of later years, because many of the

* Ch. 9.
† See Part 2, ch. 6.
‡ See Part 2, ch. 6.
§ Ch. 4, 11, and 12.
‖ Ch. 19.
¶ Censura Operibus Ambrosii prefixa.

passages he relates looks so like the fabulous stories of the monks; and I am almost of his opinion, partly for his reason, and partly for another which I mention hereafter*. —It must either be so, or else this Paulinus must have been a very vain and credulous man. Neither would I set down the passage here following, which seems as fabulous and idle as any of them, were it not that most of the critics and learned men have an opinion of the authenticity of the tract, and do commonly quote it. —He relates a great many different occasions, on which St. Ambrose's ghost or shape appeared to several persons, after he was dead; and, among the rest, how, he having departed this life on Easter-eve [297], his body was carried and laid in the great church.

"Ibique eadem fuit nocte quam vigilamus in Pascha. Quem plurimi infantes baptizati, quum a fonte venirent, viderunt; ita ut aliqui sedentem in cathedra tribunali dicerint, alii vero ascendentem suis parentibus digito ostenderent. Sed illi videntes videre non poterant, quia mundatos oculos non habebant."

'And there it was that night which we spend in 'watching at Easter [*this was the night before Easter-day, on which, in the primitive times, the whole body of the people did always sit up all night in the church at their prayers*]; and a great many of the infants 'that were then baptized saw him as they came back 'from the font; some of them saying *There he sits in the bishop's chair*; others of them shewed him to their 'parents, pointing with their hands, that he was *going there up the steps*; but the parents looking could not 'see him, because they had not their eyes cleansed [*or enlightened*].

There you have the story, such as it is, grounded, probably, on the superstitious conceits of women and boys; but yet it shews that there were children among those that were baptized on that day. He calls them

* Part 2, ch. 3.

Infants; but some of them could not be absolute infants, for he mentions their speaking: they seem to have been little boys carried in their parents' arms, or led in their hands.

These infants, according to this story, being by their baptism, just then received, clear from all sin, had their eyes enlightened to see this miracle; but their parents having been, since their baptism, stained with many sins, were not capable of it. They called *baptism*, both in the Scripture times, as appears from Heb. vi. 4, and also in these times, φωτισμὸς, *the Illumination*, or *Enlightening* of a person.

CHAPTER XIX.

FROM ST. HIEROM AND ST. AUSTIN, AFTER THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY; FROM PELAGIUS, CELESTIUS, INNOCENT THE FIRST, ZOSIMUS, JULIANUS, &c.; AND FROM THE COUNCILS OF CARTHAGE, DIOSPOLIS, MILEVIS, &c.

[Year after the Apostles 310.]

A New heresy happening in the church at this time, gave more occasion to speak of infant baptism than ever had been before, — not that any of the parties disapproved of it; but one of them held that there is no original sin in infants; and that brought in much discourse about their baptism.

Pelagius, a monk, living at Rome, was the author of this heresy, at least, the first promoter of it in the west; and one Celestius, another monk, was his chief abettor; and afterward, Julianus a bishop, and Anianus a deacon. It was not started till the year of Christ 410. But most of the managers on each side were men of note before the year 400.

The men that I named were the only writers of the Pelagian side; but a considerable number of the people was brought over to incline to their opinions. They argued, That the doctrine of original sin and natural

corruption, by which persons are supposed to be born under a necessity of sinning, did cast a reflection on the honour and justice of God, who gives us our being; and this argument was plausible among the vulgar; consequently to this, they said, That baptism of infants was not for any sin they had, but to gain them admittance into the kingdom of Heaven; for they said that children, though they were not baptized, should have an eternal and happy life, — not in the kingdom of Heaven indeed, because our Saviour (John iii. 5) had determined the contrary; but somewhere, — they knew not where.

This, with the rest of their opinions, is briefly set forth by St. Austin, *lib. de Hæresibus*, c. 88.

For better apprehending the sense of the quotations which we shall produce, a short history of the steps and progress of this sect would be useful; which is also the more necessary, because a late author has wrote the history of it very partially for those heretics; pretending to give * an abstract of what Bishop Usher had collected † of this history, he has picked out of it, for the most part, only such circumstances and such sayings of Pelagius, as, taken by themselves, sound most favourably for him; and such of St. Austin and St. Hierom as are most liable to exception.

It is great pity that, among all the learned and true histories of Pelagianism, only that should have the luck to be translated into English; but the world knows now by whose means that, and the *Lives of some Fathers*, written by the same author, and in the same vein, have been tacked together, and put into the hands of our vulgar readers.

It seems that, though it be a great fault to write the lives of the Catholic fathers *encomiastically*, yet it is none to write the lives of the old heretics so; and one that in reading the books of the ancient Christians,

* Bibliotheque Universel, tom. 8.

† Britannic. Ecclesiarum Antiquitates quibus inserta est pestiferæ adv. Dei gratiam a Pelagio Britanno inductæ Hæreseos Historia.

passes by the best, and picks out, for a specimen of their works, what may be censured in them, is a good author: though he that passes by their *nævi*, and takes most notice of what is most material, does so great a mischief; or else it is, that the booksellers of Amsterdam will give more money for the copy of a book of the first than of the latter sort, not regarding which does most good or hurt to the cause of Christianity; but which men will have the most curiosity to see and to buy; — as it is said of Bleau, that he procured a Socinian book, which he had printed, to be burnt by the hangman, that the edition might sell the better *.

This author notes †, that we have no account of Celestius's doctrine but from his adversaries, though St. Austin quotes largely the acts of the council where he spoke, and his own books; and that, possibly, the sayings objected to him in the council, were but consequences drawn from what he had said, though his book, and the chapters of it, be quoted in the council; and concludes that St. Austin and Pelagius did not understand one another's terms and meaning; and that, in many parts of this dispute, they were like two men of different languages, that should scold as loud as they could, without understanding what each other said; and reciting the Emperor's edict against the Pelagians, says, "Suspicious persons will think this edict, expressed in so pathetic terms, comes from the pen of some ecclesiastical zealot." One may know who he means; and endeavouring to shew that St. Austin and St. Hierom, the chief opposers of the Pelagian doctrine, do contradict one another about a main point of it, viz. the possibility of keeping the commandments, he, by a gross mistake, quotes ‡ Pelagius's words against Hierom, as if they were St. Austin's (as I shall by and by shew, having occasion to recite § those words); at which rate he may well prove that St. Austin contradicts St. Hierom.

I call this mistake *gross*, because Bishop Usher, in

* La Religion des Hollandois, p. 83. † Page 182, edit. 1688.
‡ Page 219. § Sect. 29, Notes on Pelagius's Creed, Note *o*.

the treatise which the man is here epitomizing, shews that the 191 *Serm. de Tempore*, among the works of St. Austin (from whence these words are taken) is not his; but is long ago known to be Pelagius's Confession of Faith to Pope Innocent; and, which makes it the more unpardonable, he himself had a little before * followed Usher, in observing that *that* piece, which, among the works of St. Hierom, is called *Symboli Explanatio ad Damasum* is really Pelagius's said Confession; and if he had looked into this 191 *Serm. de Tempore*, which he here quotes, he would have seen that and the said *Symboli Explanatio* to be both one; and Bishop Usher, where he observes the one, observes the other. The man that is capable of such palpable mistakes in the main matters which he is arguing, ought, for shame, to give over criticizing with so censorious a contempt as he does on the works of men of known and solid learning, where the matter that he remarks is, for the most part, only some trifling nicety.

Pelagius was a Briton born; — the only man of that ancient church that ever made a figure in the Roman world. He is supposed to have been called here, in his own country, Morgan; because that name, in the British language, signifies the same that Pelagius does in Latin and Greek, viz. *belonging to the sea*. He lived a good while at Rome, in great credit and esteem for piety, parts, and learning; respected and loved by the most accomplished men of that time, such as St. Austin, Paulinus, Rufinus, &c. even they that condemned his opinion owned his ingenuity. Most nations that have had any very learned or ingenious man, in the most ancient times, keep his works as a monument of remembrance. Pelagius's works were, most of them, not all, tinctured with his heresy; and the chief of them are lost. Those that remain, though they are by nigh 200 years the ancientest of any extant, written by a native of this land, yet have not had the favour to be done into English. I have occasion to give by and

* Page 180.

by his *Confession of Faith* at large, which is so handsomely drawn up, that it has passed, as was observed before, sometimes for St. Austin's, sometimes for St. Hierom's!

Some late writers do think he was a Scotsman; and Garner, the Jesuit, has lately set up that opinion, by running into a mistake of the sense of a place in St. Hierom, which mistake Bishop Usher had rectified long before *. All that is in it is this: — Celestius was an Irishman; and they at that time were called *Scoti*, and their country *Scotia*; and, therefore, of him indeed St. Hierom says, † "He is by origin of the Scottish nation;" and again *Scoticis pultibus prægravatus*; — 'having 'his belly filled, and his head bedulled with Scots por-'ridge;' — and Dempster, the Scot, took on him to maintain, that not only he, but a great many others that, in old writings, are called Scoti, were of that Scotland which now goes by that name; whom Bishop Usher does handsomely expose for that mistake; and yet it is followed by Mr. Le Clerc as to Celestius; but if that were true, it would not concern Pelagius, whom St. Hierom does at that place distinguish from Celestius as Pluto from Cerberus.

All ancient writers style him a *Briton*; and Dempster himself (using the word improperly) calls him *English*; and we understand by St. Austin [ep. 106, *ad Paulinum*] that he was commonly called *Pelagius Brito*, to distinguish him from another Pelagius, of Tarentum. As for the present Scotland, Garner, and they that take this from him, ought, if they compare the time in which Pelagius lived, to remember that at that time that country was as fruitful of authors as Lapland or Greenland is now.

Pelagius had written some learned works, as *Three Books of the Trinity*, &c. before ‡ he fell into those new opinions against original sin, and against the necessity

* Brit. Eccles. Antiq. c. 8, pag. 209, edit. 1639.
† Procem. in lib. 1, et Procem in lib. 3, Comment. in Hierom.
‡ Gennad. de Scriptoribus, c. 42.

of God's grace for our doing good works, which were the two chief of the heterodox tenets held by him; and when he had in his own breast entertained them, he at first expressed them slily in discourse among the people, or wrote them as the * objections of other men (much after the rate as Bishop Taylor of late days wrote his Arguments for Antipædobaptism) as if it were only for disputation's sake. These, his discourses, were remembered and more minded afterwards.

So, for example, before he declared himself, he wrote a short Exposition on St. Paul's Epistles; and in that to the Romans, on ch. v. ver. 12, he wrote thus, as St. Austin quotes his words: —

† "They that are against the derivation of sin [*or original sin*] endeavour to disprove it thus: — 'If Adam's sin (say they) hurts those that do not sin themselves, then Christ's righteousness may profit those that do not believe; for, he says they are as much, nay more, saved by one, than they were before dead by one.'

"And then, say they, 'If baptism does cleanse that old offence, [or take away original sin] then they that are born of parents both baptized, must be without this sin; for the parents could not transmit that which they had not.'

"This also (say they) may be added, 'If the soul be not by propagation, but the flesh only, then that only has original sin, and that only deserves punishment; for it is unjust (say they) that a soul, created but to-day, and that not out of the mass of Adam, should bear the burden of another person's sin committed so long ago.'

"They say also, 'That it ought by no means to be granted, that God, who forgives us our own sins, should impute to us other peoples.'"

Then St. Austin adds, "You see Pelagius put all this into his writings not in his own name, but in the

* August. de Peccato Orig. c. 21.
† De Peccator. Meritis, lib. 3, c. 2, 3.

name of others; being so satisfied that this was a novelty, which but now began to make a noise against the old and settled opinion of the church, that he was ashamed or afraid to own it himself; and perhaps he is not of that opinion himself that a person is born without sin, to whom he confesses baptism (in which remission of sins is granted) to be necessary;" and a little after, having shewn how contrary this opinion is to Scripture, he says, "I believe a man that is so excellent a Christian, does not at all hold these and the other absurdities that are so perverse and contrary to Christian truth."

This St. Austin says in a book, written *anno Domini* 412 [312], several years after Pelagius had wrote his Exposition on the Epistles; so that he had not even then absolutely declared himself, at least St. Austin did not know that he had; but afterward, as St. Austin says in a later book, * "Being become a heretic, he maintained these same things with a most resolute obstinacy."

Anno Dom. 410, Rome was taken and sacked by the Goths. Then, or quickly after, Pelagius and Celestius, who, during their living there, had privately sowed the seeds of this heresy, departed from thence. They are found to have been both in Africa in the year 411 [311]. Pelagius went † quickly from thence into the east countries. Celestius staid there, and attempted to take priest's orders in the Church of Carthage; but some of the clergy of that church having heard something of his tenets, insisted that he should be first examined about them; so at an assembly or council held there, *anno* 412 [312], he was challenged by Paulinus, a deacon of that church, as having maintained several false doctrines; and, among the rest, these four:—

"1. That Adam was created mortal; and that whether he had sinned or not, he would have died.

"2. That the sin of Adam hurt himself only, and not mankind.

* Retractat. lib. 2, c. 33.
† Aug. de Gestis Palæstin. c. 22.

"3. That infants new born are in the same state that Adam was before his fall.

"4. That a man may be without sin, and keep the commandments of God easily, if he will."

I had occasion to set down the Acts of the Council, which contain the accusations and his answers to them, in ch. 5. If the reader turn back thither, he will see the substance of them to be, that he would not own original sin, though he did not then absolutely deny it; but infant baptism he confessed to be necessary, and that he had never held otherwise.

He also then put in his plea in writing (a *Libellus* St. Austin calls it, or confession of his belief) in which he confessed "That infants have redemption by the baptism of Christ" (as the bishops in a council that was held there five years after [316], do mention in their letter * to Innocent); from which concession St. Austin (who was not at that council) afterward argued,† "By that word, *redemption*, he has stopt up his way [*for any farther denial of original sin*]; for from what are they redeemed but from the power of Satan?" &c.

The issue of the council was, Celestius was refused, and all that held such opinions condemned: and he went from Carthage, saying, that he would refer himself to Innocent, bishop of Rome; which he never found it for his purpose to do.

About this time, *anno* 412, St. Austin [312] wrote his first treatise against those, that held these opinions (who were afterward called Pelagians; as yet Pelagius himself, though he had set them on foot, did not declare himself; and when St. Austin mentions him in this book, it is with respect, and hoping he would not maintain them). They were much talked of at Carthage, where Pelagius and Celestius had been; and Marcellinus, a nobleman living at that city, sent to St. Austin to desire his resolution of the difficulties raised

* Epist. Synodic. Concilii Carthag. ad Innocent. apud Augustin. Ep. 90. † Ep. 89. ad Hilarium.

about them. It was in answer to that desire that he wrote two books; and a little after, a third book (or epistle) entitled *Of the Guilt and Forgiveness of Sins, and of the Baptism of Infants.* The scope of them is to prove the doctrine of original sin to be true, and that chiefly from the baptism of infants; and to assert the necessity of God's grace, and to answer the objections.

In the first he discourses of the state of Adam before and after his fall; shews that his seed do derive sin from him, not by imitation only (as these men explained the Scripture sayings) but by propagation; that this propagated corruption is in all persons, even in infants, that have no actual sin.

He proves this, first by texts of Scripture, then by other arguments; and, among the rest, by this, That infants are by all Christians acknowledged to stand in need of baptism, which must be in them for original sin, since they have no other. He mentions and replies to some answers which the denyers of original sin gave to this last argument, which pressed them very hard.

1. Some said * that infants have actual sin; meaning their peevishness, &c. and that they may have need to be baptized for that. These men he judges unworthy of any answer here, as arguing against plain sense; yet at the end of the book he spends some time in answering them.

2. Some said † They are baptized, not for forgiveness of sin, but that they may be made heirs of the kingdom of Heaven. It is to be noted, the Pelagians held a middle state between Heaven and Hell. "These men (says St. Austin) if they be asked whether infants not baptized, and not made heirs of the kingdom, have yet the benefit of eternal salvation at the resurrection of the dead, *laborant vehementer, nec exitum inveniunt*, are at a great plunge, and can find no way out of it."

"Quis enim Christianorum ferat, cum dicitur ad æter-

* Cap. 17. † Cap. 18.

namsalutem posse quenquam pervenire, si non renascatur in Christo quod per baptismum fieri voluit?" &c.

'For what Christian man can endure to hear it said 'That any person may come to eternal salvation that 'is not regenerated in Christ? which he has ordered to 'be done by baptism,' &c.

And whereas these men distinguished between salvation and the kingdom of Heaven, and said, Children might be saved without baptism, though not come to the kingdom of Heaven. He brings in that text, (Tit. iii. 5.) *He saved us by the washing of regeneration*, &c.; as he does in a following chapter that of St. Peter, 1 Ep. iii. 21. *Baptism doth save us.* He proceeds, Who dares to affirm that infants may be saved without that regeneration, as if Christ had not died for them? for Christ died for sinners; and if these, who, it is plain, have committed no sin in their own life, are not held captive under the original bond of sin neither, how did Christ, who died for sinners, die for them? If they are not diseased with any sickness of original sin, why are they carried to Christ the Physician, to receive the sacrament of their eternal salvation, by the godly fear of their friends that run with them to it? Why is it not said to them in the church "Carry back from hence these innocent creatures; *the whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick: Christ came not to call the righteous, but sinners?*"

"Nunquam dictum est, nunquam dicitur, nunquam omnino dicetur in ecclesia Christi tale commentum."

'So odd a thing never was said, never is said, nor 'ever will be said in the church of Christ.'

Concerning what was then said, or what had ever been said, St. Austin was a proper judge; but we find now that for what would be said in after-times he did not guess altogether right, if he meant that no Christians would ever say so.

Then * he answers the objections of those who said If infants were sinners, it were needful for them to repent; which, since they cannot do, it is a sign that baptism is not in their case used for forgiveness of sin. His answer is, That in like manner as they profess faith by the words of those that bring them, they do also go for penitents, when by the words of the same bearers they do renounce the Devil and the world.

Whereas they objected † if all infants are sinful, what justice is it that some should happen to have baptism, and so be forgiven; and others, no more sinful than they, should miss it, and so be condemned? He desires them to answer first, If all infants are sinless, what justice is it that some should happen to have baptism, and so be admitted into the kingdom of Heaven; and others, as sinless as they, should miss it, and so be excluded? He teaches that all such things are to be referred to the unsearchable wisdom of God.

He refutes ‡ those that, knowing not what else to say, ventured upon the exploded opinion of Plato and Origen, That the souls of infants have lived before in another state or world, and have sinned there; and so pleaded, that possibly it is for those sins that they are here baptized. He stops their mouths with that Scripture, Rom. ix. 11, *The children being not yet born, having done neither good nor evil,* &c. and with several other arguments; but that one is enough.

Having occasionally said ‖ that infants till they are baptized do abide in darkness, he recites an objection of some that all that are born are enlightened from that text, § *That was the true light that lighteth every man* [or person] *that comes into the world.* Whereupon he says "If that be so, it is a strange thing that they, being enlightened by the only Son, who was in the beginning with God, God the Word, should not be admitted into the kingdom of God, nor be heirs of God, nor joint heirs with Christ! for that this is not granted them

* Cap. 19. † Cap. 21. ‡ Cap. 22. ‖ Cap. 25.
§ John i. 9.

but by baptism, even they that are of this opinion do confess."

He cites abundance of places * of Scripture, to shew that all that Christ came to save, as Mediator, are by the Scripture supposed to have been in a lost condition: he came, he took flesh, he submitted himself to the form of a servant, died, &c. that he might quicken those that were dead, save those that were lost, free those that were in slavery, redeem those that were in captivity, enlighten those that were in darkness, rescue those that were under the power of Satan, &c.; from whence he says it follows "That they do not belong to this dispensation of Christ, fulfilled by his humiliation, who have no need of life, salvation, deliverance, redemption, &c. and, consequently, baptism is not necessary for those who have no need of the benefit of forgiveness and reconciliation by the Mediator."

"Porro quia parvulos baptizandos esse concedunt, qui contra autoritatem universæ ecclesiæ, proculdubio per Dominum et apostolos traditam, venire non possunt," &c.

'Now then, since they grant that infants must be 'baptized, as not being able to oppose the authority 'of the whole church, which was, doubtless, delivered 'by our Lord and his apostles, they must consequently grant that they stand in need of the benefits of 'the Mediator; that being offered by the sacrament 'and by the charity of the faithful, and so being incorporated into Christ's body, they may be reconciled to 'God; that in him they may be quickened, saved, delivered, redeemed, enlightened; from what, but from 'death, wickedness, guilt, slavery, and darkness of 'sins? which, since they have committed none in their 'own life at that age, there remains [*nothing that they can be guilty of but*] original sin.'

He disputes largely † against their opinion of a mid-

* Cap. 26, 27. † Cap. 28.

dle state, proving "That there is no salvation but in the kingdom of God; nor any middle place where any one can be, except with the Devil, who is not with Christ. Hence our Lord himself, that he might raze out of the minds of mistaken men any opinion of I know not what middle state, which some men go about to attribute to unbaptized infants; as that they shall, being sinless, be in eternal life, but not being baptized, shall not be with Christ in his kingdom, gave this definitive sentence to stop their mouths, *He that is not with me is against me.* Give us, therefore, an infant; if he be with Christ already, what is he baptized for? But if, as the truth is, he be therefore baptized that he may be with Christ, then it is sure that before he is baptized he is not with Christ."

Though St. Austin here, in the heat of this dispute, do once use this expression, of unbaptized infants being with the Devil, since, by the Pelagians' confession, they are not with Christ, yet he means but a very moderate degree of condemnation or misery; not like that of wicked men, but such as may be preferable to no being at all; as I shall shew hereafter *.

He goes on † to prove his point from the name or title given by our Saviour to baptism (John iii. 5.) *Except one be born again,* [or regenerated] &c. He says, These men, if they were not moved [*or convinced*] by this sentence, would determine that infants are not to be baptized at all. And he argues, Why born again, but to be renewed? Renewed from what, but from the old nature, *a vetustate?* From what old nature but that wherein our old nature is crucified with him, that the ‡ body of sin might be destroyed?

He confirms the same sense by the following parts of our Saviour's discourse with Nicodemus §, *That which is born of the flesh, is flesh; i. e.* as St. Austin takes it, is corrupt or sinful: *and that which is born of the spirit, is spirit; i. e.* is renewed or sanctified.

---

* Part 2, ch. vi. † Cap. 30, 31, &c. ‡ Rom. vi. 6.
§ John iii. 6.

He takes notice * that those particular men at Carthage, of whom Marcellinus had wrote to him, did grant That in baptism there is forgiveness of sins given to infants; not that they have any original sin, but they have sinned since they were born. He takes notice how much these differ from the others whom he had been hitherto refuting, and one of whose books he had seen. The one, says he, minding the Scriptures, and the authority of the whole church, and the form of the sacrament itself, see well that baptism in infants is for remission of sins; but cannot see, or will not own, that it is original sin. The other, considering human nature, see well, as it is easy to do, that *that* age cannot in its own life have contracted any sin; but, rather than confess original sin, say there is no sin at all in infants. He bids these two parties first agree among themselves: for if each grant to the other that which they urge of truth, they will both hold the whole truth.

However, he does condescend † for the sake of these latter, to shew at large how impossible it is for a new-born infant, that has no knowledge of good or evil, to be guilty of actual sin. But it seems a flat and needless discourse; because, as he there observes, A man is never more troubled to find what to say than when the thing he would prove is of itself plainer than any thing he can say.

What we can observe out of these passages of the first book (besides what has been observed before) is the tenet of Pelagius and his followers: they denied original sin. The Catholics, among other arguments against them, urged this, — That infants have sin is proved from the need they have of baptism; and other than original sin they cannot have. The Pelagians did not pretend to deny the necessity of infant baptism; which had been highly for their purpose to do if they had thought they could have justified such a denial. And when St. Austin mentions it as a practice of the whole church from the apostles' time, they do not deny it, but own it, as

* Cap. 34. † Cap. 35.

we shall see hereafter; only they said baptism, in the case of an infant, is not for forgiveness of sin (though they were driven from this hold too afterward, as we shall see) but to procure the child an entrance into the kingdom of Heaven. For they held, that an infant dying unbaptized, shall be raised again, and live eternally in a certain middle state without punishment, as having no sin; but not enjoying the kingdom of Heaven, as being not baptized into Christ: but that a baptized infant shall go into the kingdom of Heaven.

As for that plea that infants have actual sin, and are baptized for that, it was the tenet only of some ignorant persons among them whom Marcellinus had mentioned; Pelagius and Celestius did not stand to that; but they held for a while stiff in their refusal to own baptism of infants to be for forgiveness.

Celestius had, as I said before, used the word *redemption* as applied to infants by their baptism. And the same thing St. Austin observes here*, They grant redemption to be necessary for them, as is contained in a very short book of one of them, who yet would not plainly express there the forgiveness of any sin. And again, Though they have not been willing in their writings plainly to own forgiveness of sins to be necessary for infants, yet they have owned redemption to be needful for them †.

The second book of this work is on another subject, viz. St. Austin's resolution of this question put to him by Marcellinus, Whether there is, or ever was, or ever will be, any man without sin beside our Saviour Christ?

As the Pelagians denied the original corruption of our nature, so accordingly they magnified the present freedom and goodness of it; and some at this time went so far, or, as St. Austin here expresses it, presumed so much on the freedom of man's will, as to be of opinion that we have no need to be assisted by God to avoid sin, after he has once granted to our nature the power of free-will ‡. In confuting this opinion of theirs he has not

* Cap. 34. † Lib. 2, Cap. 36. ‡ Lib. 2, c. 2.

much occasion to speak of infant baptism, so I should pass it by; but the indignation to see the ancient fathers so misrepresented as they are by some modern writers (with what intent they do this God knows) forces me to give in short the substance of his answer to this question, that it may appear how falsely he and St. Hierom are charged to contradict one another in the substantial part of their answer.

St. Austin divides this question into four: —

* 1. Whether the thing be possible, viz. for a man to live without sin?

To this he answers, "I shall confess it to be possible by the grace of God and the free-will of man;" explaining himself so as that God can, if he please, give such a measure of grace as that a man should ever choose and do what is best.

2. Whether this do ever come to pass?

Answ. † "I do not believe there is any such thing; I rather believe the Scripture, which says *Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for in thy sight shall no man living be justified.*" Here he produces many texts, proving all men to be sinners.

3. If it be possible so to be, and yet never be so, what is the reason?

Answ. ‡ "I might answer easily and truly thus: Because men will not. But if I am asked why they will not? there's a great deal to be said: yet leaving room for a more diligent enquiry, I shall answer to this also in short. Men will not do what is good, either because they are not convinced that it is good, or because it does not please them."

4. Whether there be, or ever can be, a man that has never had any sin?

He answers No§; because, suppose any man should by God's grace arrive to that perfection as not to sin any more; yet, having been conceived in sin, it will be true of him that he had sins before he was converted to that newness of life.

---

* Cap. 6. † Cap. 7. ‡ Cap. 17. § Cap. 20.

He proves these his answers largely, and answers the objections raised from 1 John v. 18, *He that is born of God sinneth not*; and from what is said of Job, and of Zacharias and Elizabeth being blameless, upright, &c.

And whereas this sort of men did use to catch and baffle the people with such logical quirks as these — *Si nolumus non peccamus:* 'We do not sin whether we 'will or no:' and *possibilia Deus mandata dedit, aut impossibilia*, &c*. 'The things that God hath set us 'to do are either possible things, or impossible; if pos-'sible, we may perform them if we will; if impossible, 'then we are in no fault for not doing impossible 'things.' From whence they concluded that it was certainly true which they maintained, That a man may be without sin, and keep God's commandments easily, if he will.

St. Austin answers thus: They seem to themselves witty when they say (as if any of us did not know that) that we do not sin whether we will or no; and that God would never command a man that which is impossible to human will. But they do not see that to overcome some things which are either corruptly desired or corruptly feared, there is occasion for the strong, and sometimes the utmost effort of the will [*or resolution*] which he foresaw we should not perfectly exert in all cases, who would have it truly foretold by the prophet, *In thy sight shall no man living be justified*.

I recite this to shew that the grounds on which St. Austin opposed this presumptuous doctrine, are not different from those on which St. Hierom did; as the author I spake of before † would make us believe; for the answer given by St. Hierom to the same cavils is this: he had recited the objection about *possible* and *impossible*; he had shewed that some men that are commendable for one quality are faulty for another, and that none is perfect in all. Then to the dilemma he answers ‡ They are possible things which God has commanded, I own it; but even for these possible things

* Hierom. lib. 1, contra Pelagianos. † Sect. 2. ‡ Dial. 1.

we cannot every one of us have all of them; and this, not by reason of the weakness [*or inability*] of nature that you may not rail, but because of the weariness of the mind, which cannot have all virtues together and keep them always; and if you will reproach the Creator for that, because he has made you such a creature as does flag or grow weary, I will tell you again, it will be a smarter reprehension of him if you find fault with him that he has not made you a God. But you will say If I cannot do it I am in no sin; you are in a sin; why could not you do that which another could do? and again, he, in comparison of whom you are worse, will be a sinner himself in comparison of some other, or of you in some other quality.

This is the saying of St. Hierom, which that writer instances in * as contrary to St. Austin's doctrine; but proves it no other way than by shewing that Pelagius (whom he takes to be St. Austin) rails against it. The answers of the one and of the other of these fathers are for substance the same, viz. That though it be, logically speaking, true which the Pelagians urged, That we may do all that we can do (the denial of it being a contradiction) yet there is no man living but at sometimes he is slothful or weary, or not so watchful against sin and passion, as he himself will confess afterward he might have been; and this comes upon a man in spite of the firmest resolution that he can have settled before hand.

The same author in the same treatise represents the tenets of Pelagius and St. Austin very partially; and after such a manner as if St. Austin had produced no other proof against Pelagius of the need we all stand in of God's assisting grace in order to live well, than what was fetched from the doctrine of absolute and particular predestination. The difference then, says he, † between St. Austin and Pelagius in this matter was this, that the first believed that since the sin of Adam, his posterity are so corrupted that they are born with such dis-

* Bibliotheque Univers. t. 8, pag. 219. † Bibl. t. 8, pag. 195

positions to evil as do necessarily carry them to sin; that if God will bring any one to good, he must for every good action give him a grace which shall inevitably make him will that which is good: and for the rest, those to whom he does not give such a grace are damned. God, by a wisdom which we understand not, having a mind that mankind should be born under an inevitable necessity of sinning, and of being accordingly tormented with eternal punishments, without delivering from this doleful necessity any more than a very small number of persons to whom he gives an invincible grace.

Now besides that, the opinion of St. Austin concerning predestination is here very invidiously and disadvantageously represented; and that of Pelagius is as much smoothed over. What an unfair account is it of the controversy between them, to make it turn upon that point! St. Austin brought many other proofs and reasons in this dispute, such as are owned to be valid, not only by those that approve the opinion he held about predestination, but by those that dislike it. God forbid all should be Pelagians that have not the same conceptions that St. Austin had about that other matter: Pelagianism has been accounted an heretical doctrine in all ages of the church, and in all particular churches; even in those in which the doctrine of predestination has been variously explained. It is one thing thankfully to own the assistance of God's Spirit in all the good purposes and spiritual strength we have; and another to determine that God limits this grace and assistance to a certain number of particular persons, or gives it in an irresistible degree: or, to speak plainly, there is a great difference between the Arminian and the Pelagian tenets. Concerning the first, most men are now agreed to bear with one another in any difference about them; but they that would obliterate the doctrine of original sin, and of the necessity of God's grace, we know not whither they would lead us, nor what part of our religion they will leave us.

The Arminians or Remonstrants did, at the Synod of Dort, exhibit an account of their tenets in this matter,

wherein they frankly confess God's grace to be necessary, not only as it illuminates our understanding, but also *voluntati vires confert ad non peccandum:* 'It gives 'strength to the will to avoid sin;' and not only to teach us what we ought to do; but also *ut quod factu opus est, facere diligamus et valeamus:* 'That we may be able to do, and may love to do, that which we ought;' which was the thing required of Pelagius to confess, and on the owning whereof he would have been acquitted. They do also show how far they differ from the Pelagians (and even from the Semipelagians) in all those other things for which either of the said parties were condemned by the church of that time. This they do in the * declaration of their tenet on the third and fourth of the five articles. What then makes this man (who professes that way) to talk of Pelagianism as if it were so tacked to Arminianism that St. Austin could not confute the one without confuting the other? — and to represent St. Hierom, who confuted Pelagius without having recourse to St. Austin's opinion of predestination, as a † Semipelagian?

Whereas the chief point on which Pelagius was condemned, was his denial of any such thing as an internal grace of God's spirit moving and inclining the heart to faith, love, obedience, &c. which we ought to pray to God for. This historian, citing Petavius for it, reckons up six sorts of grace which Pelagius owned: — 1. God's grace in giving us a free-will; and 2, In giving a sinner pardon for sins past to encourage him; and 3, In giving his law; and 4, The grace of baptism; wherein an adult person that has sinned obtains remission of sins and the inheritance of God's kingdom: an infant has no remission of sins, as having no sin in his opinion, but yet is put into a better state, being made an heir of God's kingdom; and 5, In giving the kingdom of Heaven as a reward to encourage us. These five no body accused

* Acta et Scripta Synodalia Dordracena Remonstrantium, &c. Harderwici, 1620, p. 23, &c. † Bibl. t. 8, pag. 194.

him of denying; but here * he is said to have owned another sort of grace, viz. The internal illumination of our spirit, which Pelagius expresses in this wise: —

"I confess that grace consists not only in the law but in God's assistance; for God assists us by his doctrine and his revelation in opening the eyes of our hearts; in declaring to us the things that shall be hereafter, that we may not be fixed to the present things; in discovering to us the snares of the Devil; in enlightening us by the manifold and unspeakable gift of his heavenly grace. Does he that speaks thus, think you, deny the grace of God? Does he not confess at once both God's grace and man's free-will?"

It is true St. Austin does quote these and such other words out of Pelagius's third book of Free-will; but he shows at the same place †. that they are used by him only for a blind, and that his other sayings in the same book are such as will not suffer these to be understood in a Catholic sense. Both St. Hierom and St. Austin give this account of him (which they prove by several instances) that though he held those singular opinions, and propagated them privately in the minds of his followers, yet he was very unwilling to be convicted of so doing; and therefore used in his writings a great deal of equivocation. He would say such things as looked like an owning of internal grace, but still would take care to place his words so as that he could, when occasion required, explain them to mean only that grace or mercy of God by which he gives us good rules, doctrines, revelations, promises, &c.: and so here he limits (as St. Austin observes) all that he speaks of to doctrine and revelation; and he does not name it *internal* as Mr. Le Clerc does.

St. Austin shews him to have used the same artifice through all his four books of Free-will, which he wrote on purpose to vindicate his reputation; and yet even there he never spoke home to the owning of God's grace in the Catholic sense, but often to the denying of

* Bibl. p. 198. † De Gratiâ Christi, lib. 1, c. 7.

it. He says there, in the same book out of which the foresaid specious words are quoted, * "We distinguish between these three things, and place them each in their due order: in the first place, we rank *posse*, the power [*of doing any thing*]; in the second, *velle*, the will to do it; in the third, *esse*, the being of the thing. We say the power is in our nature; the will, *in arbitrio*, in our choice; the being, in the effect. The first, *i. e.* the power, properly belongs to God, who has given it to his creature; but the other two, *i. e.* the will and the being, are to be referred to the man, because they come from the fountain of free-will.

And in another place † he says, by way of objection to his own assertion,

Obj. But how then shall that of the apostles stand good ‡, *It is God that worketh in you both to will and to do?*

Answ. He worketh in us to will that which is good, to will that which is holy, inasmuch as by the greatness of the future glory and his promise of reward, he encourages us who are given to earthly desires, and do love only things before our eyes as brute beasts; inasmuch as he raises our drowsy will by the revelation of his wisdom; inasmuch as he advises us to every good thing, &c.

All this St. Austin shews to be far short of what was necessary for him to say, if he would clear himself, because it makes God to work upon our wills only outwardly by proposals, and says "Let him once at last own that grace by which the greatness of the future glory is not only promised to us, but believed and hoped for by us, and by which his wisdom is not only revealed to us, but loved by us; and by which (*non suadetur solum omne quod bonum est, verum et persuadetur*) 'we are 'not only advised to every good thing, but prevailed on 'to follow it.'" Then having commented upon that text, *No man can come to me, except the Father who has*

* Pelagius de Libero Arbitrio, lib. 3, apud August. de Gratia Christi, lib. 1, c. 4. † Ibid. c. 10. ‡ Phil. iii. 12.

sent me draw him, — he adds, This sort of grace Pelagius ought to own if he have a mind not only to be called, but to be, a Christian.

But the event proved that he would never own that sort of grace; and that the latent meaning of all his coloured speeches was no other than what St. Austin and his other opponents took it to be: for when so much offence was taken at him that nothing was to be expected but excommunication, Celestius and he being then in the east, applied themselves to the Church of Rome to see if the apology they made for themselves would pass there. Celestius came in person, and delivered in a confession of his faith; Pelagius came not, but sent one (of which I shall by and by give a copy) and a letter with it. There happened to be then a weak bishop of that church, Zosimus, who was for the present so far imposed on by their pretences, and was so incompetent a judge of this question, and of the other about original sin (as I shew more particularly * hereafter) that he took what they said for orthodox, and blamed their accusers as having slandered them, though his predecessor Innocent had declared an ill opinion of them: but the African bishops being then in council at Carthage [317], sent their synodical epistle to Zosimus, advertising him of the craft and equivocation used by those men; and shewing, by instances, wherein his examination of them was short of what it ought to have been; and that Celestius ought particularly to recant the erroneous positions in his confession. Upon the coming of this letter, when Celestius was summoned to appear †, that by his direct and plain answer, either his hypocrisy or else his amendment might be made manifest, and be no longer ambiguous, he withdrew himself, and would not come to the hearing: so far St. Austin's words are; but Mercator gives this farther circumstance ‡, That he ran away from Rome.

This passage of the history Mr. Le Clerc leaves out,

* Sect. 33.

† August. contra duas Epistolas Pelagianorum, lib. 2, c. 3.

‡ Commonitorium, c. 1.

which none that pretended to write this history ever left out before; for it is a plain proof that the opinion against the grace of God, which the Catholics charged the Pelagians with, was their real opinion, and not wrongfully affixed on them by taking their words in a worse sense than they meant them, as he would have it believed.

The issue was, the bishops of Africa [318] continued in their resolution, and the next year sent a peremptory letter to Zosimus (who had done all he could to have these men acquitted) that they did determine, *Constituimus*, &c*. "That the sentence pronounced against Pelagius and Celestius by the reverend bishop Innocent, from the see of the blessed apostle Peter, do stand firm so long till they do by a plain confession own that we are in every action assisted by the grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ, not only to understand, but also to practise righteousness, in such wise as that without it we are not able to do, to speak, to think, or to have any thing of true and sincere piety." And Zosimus at last complied with them, and joined in giving the same sentence; and so, as Prosper tells us †, did all the world.

They were, as appears by St. Austin's words ‡, either to do penance (viz. recant their heretical opinions, whereof this of denying God's grace, and the other of original sin, were the chief); or, if they refused that, to stand condemned [*or excommunicated*]. There were also imperial edicts against them.

All that we hear of afterwards [319] that tended towards recantation was this: Pinianus, and Albina, and Melania, being then in the east, where Pelagius was, wrote to St. Austin that they had dealt with him ‖ to condemn [*or recant*] under his hand all the things that were objected to him, and that [*as to God's grace*] he had said in their hearing thus: "I do anathematize [*or renounce*] any one that says or thinks that the grace of God, by which Christ came into the world to save sin-

* Prosper contra Collat. c. 10. † Chronic ad ann. 418.
‡ De Peccato Originali, c. 22. ‖ Augustin. de Gratia Christi, c. 2.

ners, is not necessary both every hour and moment, and also in every action; and they that take away [*or deny*] this grace, are to have [*or, may they have*] eternal punishment."

St. Austin, in answer, * shews them that these words are capable of the same equivocation he was wont to use; that, probably, by *the grace of God, by which Christ came to save sinners*, he meant nothing but the pardon of sins, or the example of Christ, — the consideration of which was always necessary; that he had before, in the Synod of Diospolis [315], said as much as this comes to; for that being there accused of holding "That the grace of God is not given in every action, but does consist in our free-will, or in the law and doctrine; and, that the grace of God is given according to our deserts;" and the proof brought against him being this, That Celestius, who was his disciple, had written such things,— he answered, 'Whether these are Celestius's sayings or not, let them look to it that say they are his. I never held so, and I do anathematize any one that holds so;' — and yet that after that, he had in his books of Free-will shewn that he "had really no other sentiments than such as he seemed then to condemn."

This did not avail him. He knew well enough what words to have expressed himself in, so as to satisfy the church; but he would not use them. St. Austin told him † that "inasmuch as the question about reconciling man's free-will and God's grace is so intricate, that while one is asserted, the other may seem to be denied, if he would grant that God does not only give us a power of doing well, but does also assist us in the willing and doing of it (which, by the way, is what I shewed before that the Remonstrants do, or at least did freely own) the controversy would be at an end."

But he would never say so: he continued excommunicated, and seems to have lived obscurely all the rest of his time.

---

* Augustin. de Gratiâ Christi, c. 3. † Ibid. c. 47.

After all, it is not material to us whether he was guilty, or whether his accusers were mistaken in his sense (it were to be wished he could have been shewn to have been guiltless) were it not that some now-a-days, that have a mind to set up the same opinions to a much worse purpose than ever Pelagius did, do go about to retrieve the credit of them by discrediting the Catholic Church of that time.

That which St. Austin says to Pelagius, on this account of denying God's grace, may be applied to some of them on account (not only of that, but also) of an article of a higher nature, which they are supposed likewise not to believe: — * "He has not thought fit anywhere to own that we, when we pray, are assisted by God's grace that we may not sin; and if he does notwithstanding in his own mind believe this, he must pardon those that suspect otherwise; for he himself causes this suspicion, who when he lies under so much obloquy on that account, will believe this, and yet will not confess it. What great matter were it for him to say this, especially where he undertakes to handle and explain that point? &c. Why should he there defend nature only?" &c.

I have recited what I mean to do of the dispute concerning God's grace altogether, that it may give no interruption to what remains to be said of the other, concerning original sin, and the occasions thence taken to speak of infant baptism.

In the third of those books, "Of the Guilt and Forgiveneness of Sins, and Baptism of Infants," St. Austin having, in the foregoing chapters, recited several interpretations, of which those texts (Rom. v. 12, 13, 14, &c.) are capable, concludes in the fifth chapter, that whichsoever of them be taken, the words "can have no other sense but such an one by which it has come to pass that the whole church has from of old constantly held that *fidele* [*or baptized*] infants do obtain remission of original sin by the baptism of Christ."

* Augustin. de Natura et Gratia, c. 59.

Then he recites a large piece of the epistle of St. Cyprian to Fidus, which I gave a copy of in chap. 6, and observes how he there takes the doctrine of original sin in infants for a known and undoubted thing; and by it proves (what was then by Fidus questioned) that an infant may and must be baptized before the eighth day, if need require. Then he adds, —

* "And now some people, by the boldness of I know not what disputing humour, go about to represent *that* as uncertain which our ancestors made use of as a most certain thing, whereby to resolve some things that seemed uncertain; for, when this began first to be disputed, I know not; but this I know, that holy Hierom, whose pains and fame for excellent learning in ecclesiastical matters, is at this day so great, does also make use of this as a thing most certain, to resolve some questions in his books," &c. Then, having quoted some passages out of St. Hierom on Jonah, he proceeds: "If we could with convenience come to ask that most learned man How many writers of Christian dissertations and interpreters of holy Scripture in both languages could he recount, who from the time that Christ's church has been founded, have held no otherwise, have received no other doctrine from their predecessors, nor left any other to their successors? For my part (though my reading is much less than his) I do not remember that I ever heard any other thing from any Christians that received the Old and New Testament (*Non solum in Catholica ecclesia, verum etiam in qualibet hæresi vel schismate constitutis*); 'neither from such as were of 'the Catholic Church, nor from such as belonged to any 'sect or schism.' *Non memini me aliud legisse, &c.* "I do not remember that I ever read otherwise in any writer that I could ever find treating of these matters that followed the canonical Scriptures, or did mean or did pretend to do so. From whence it is that this trouble is started up upon us I know not; but, a little while ago,

* Cap. 6.

when I was there at Carthage, I just cursorily heard some transient discourse of some people that were talking, That infants are not baptized for that reason that they may receive remission of sins, but that they may be sanctified in Christ. Though I was something startled at the novelty, yet because it was not seasonable then to enter into any discourse against it, and because they were not persons of any such rank as to be much taken notice of, it past over with me as a thing forgotten, or not minded; and lo! now it is a thing maintained against the church with ardent endeavours; it is even by writing transmitted to memory; it is come to that difficulty that the brethren are fain to ask our opinions of the matter; and we find a necessity of disputing and writing against it."

This testimony of St. Austin must needs be looked on as a very considerable evidence. He declares, he never met with any Christian, either churchman or sectary, nor with any writer that owned the Scripture who taught any other doctrine, but that infants are baptized *for pardon of sin*. Much less then had he known or heard of any that denied that they are to be baptized at all; and they had then, as I observed before, but 300 years to look back to the times of the apostles; and St. Austin, though he speak modestly of himself as to learning, had studied the church-history so well, that in a few years after this, he published his *History of all the Sects or Opinions* that were, or had been in Christendom; out of which I quote some things in another chapter. — Ch. 21.

To that objection of Pelagius, "If baptism do take away original sin, then such children as are born of parents both baptized, must be without that sin," St. Austin answers to this purpose (cap. 8) That an error is often strengthened by putting alien and intricate questions about the matter; which is an easy thing in most matters to do. "Yet (says he) if I had this cause to manage against such men as did either deny that infants are to be baptized, or did say that it is needless to bap-

tize them, for that they being born of *fideles* [*or baptized*] persons, were necessarily partakers of their parents privilege, then I ought to take more pains in confuting this opinion." Such persons (as he shews at large) would have need to be put in mind, that, as a circumcised parent begets an uncircumcised son, and wheat that has been cleansed from the chaff, does, if it be sowed, produce wheat with chaff on it, — so a parent that has been spiritually cleansed begets a son that resembles him, not according to that state that he is in by spiritual regeneration, but according to the state he was in by carnal generation.

"But now (says he) * since we have to do with such as do confess that the children of baptized persons are to be baptized, how much better is it to say thus to them: You that do affirm that of parents cleansed from the stain of sin, such children should be born as are without sin, How is it that you do not mind that, at the same rate, you might say that of Christian parents there should be born Christian children? — and then, Why do you determine that they are to be baptized?"

Having afterward †, on this occasion, mentioned that text, 1 Cor. vii. 14, *Now are your children holy*, &c. he refers to the exposition of it which Pelagius had given, and the like to which he himself had given in a former treatise ‡ which I recited before §; and says That it must be understood so, or else in another sense which he there gives (relating to the forbearance of the use of the marriage-bed during the woman's uncleanness) or else in some other sense of which we may not be certain; and then adds,

"Illud tamen sine dubitatione tenendum est, quæcunque illa sanctificatio sit, non valere ad Christianos faciendos atque ad dimittenda peccata, nisi Christiana et ecclesiastica institutione et sacramentis efficiantur fideles. Nam nec," &c.

---

* Cap. 9. † Cap. 12.
‡ De Sermone Domini in Monte. § Ch. 15.

'But that is to be held without any doubt, that whatever that holiness [*or sanctification*] be, it is not available to the making of them Christians, or to the pardon of sins, unless they be made *fideles* by the institution [*or order*] of Christ and the church, and by the sacraments; for neither are unbelieving husbands or wives, how holy and just partners soever they have, cleansed from the iniquity which keeps them from the kingdom of God, and brings them to damnation; nor are infants, of how holy and just parents soever they come, pardoned the guilt of original sin, unless they (*i. e. the one and the other*) be baptized in Christ.'

One may here, in short, confer together the several comments of the antients on this text: — *The unbelieving husband is sanctified* [or an unbelieving husband has been sanctified] *by his wife, &c. else were your children unclean; but now they are holy.* They do, most of them, and those the most ancient, make that holiness of children relate to their baptism, as given, or to be given, before they are actually holy.

1. St. Austin, in a former book * [296], interprets *has been sanctified, i. e.* 'has been brought to the faith;'— and, *Now are your children holy, i. e.* 'Now are they baptized;' and he there gives the grounds of that interpretation; as may be seen by turning back to the place where I recited it (ch. 15); and here he says again, it must be interpreted so, or else certainly, in some such sense as does not make them holy, so as to inherit the kingdom, unless they be baptized.

2. He also here recites [299] the explication that Pelagius had given of this text; and says "Pelagius, when he wrote on this epistle, expounded it thus:—

"Exempla jam præcesserant et virorum quos uxores, et fœminarum quas mariti, lucrifecerant Christo, et parvulorum ad quos faciendos Christianos voluntas Christiana etiam unius parentis evicerat."

* De Sermone Domini in Monte, lib. 1, c. 27.

'There were by this time examples, both of men 'whom their wives, and of women whom their husbands had gained over to Christ; and of infants, concerning whom the Christian desire, even of one of their 'parents, had prevailed that they should be made Christians.'

He manifestly paraphrases these words (*now are they holy*) thus:— "Now are they made Christians; and the unbelieving party *has been sanctified*," *i. e.* has been gained over to Christ.

The very same explication is, as they say, still extant at this text, in those *Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles* that go under the name of St. Hierom, but are Pelagius's, only interpolated.

3. Tertullian [100], speaking of the privilege that infants have by being of Christian parents, or of one parent such, says, "Now are they holy," *i. e.* designed for holiness; for otherwise, the apostle knew what our Lord had determined, *Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God*; that is, he shall not be holy. — See the place at large, chap. 4.

4. Origen also, having an eye to this text, in his *Comment. in Matt.* p. 332, edit. *Rotom*, 1668, shews how he understood ἡγίασται here. Ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς ἀμφοτέρων ἀπίστων, ὅτε μὲν ὁ ἀνὴρ πρότερον πιστύσας τῷ χρόνῳ σώζει τὸν γυναῖκα· ὅτε δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ἀρξαμένη ὕστερόν ποτε πείθει τὸν ἄνδρα. 'When a man and his wife are both 'unbelievers, sometimes the man believing first in time, 'saves his wife; and sometimes the wife believing first, 'does a while after persuade her husband.'

He that so paraphrases the man *sanctified*, *i. e.* converted to the Christian religion, could not well understand the *sanctity* [or holiness] of the children, otherwise than their being baptized into it.

5. Paulinus writes to St. Hierom this question [293], "How are they holy, whenas without the gift of the grace [viz. *baptism*] given them afterward [*after their birth*] and preserved, they cannot be saved?" — See chap. 18.

6. St. Hierom for answer refers him to the forementioned resolution of Tertullian; but withal mentions some other interpretations about legal cleanness or uncleanness.

The same father, in his epistle to Leta (epist. 7) a Christian woman, daughter of Albinus, a Heathen, priest of Jupiter, having mentioned this text, says, It had been verified in her family; for that she, who had been born *de impari matrimonio*, 'of an unequal mar-'riage,' *i. e.* her father a Heathen; but her mother being a Christian, "The sweetness of the fruit had recompensed for the bitterness of the root; and an ill shrub had sweat forth precious balsam, &c. We have born [*or waited*] to good purpose. A holy and Christian family does sanctify one unbeliever. He [Albinus himself] is now a candidate of the faith, since he is encompassed with a multitude of his children and grandchildren that believe. I fancy that Jupiter himself might have believed, if he had *had* such kindred." Since he makes this to be a fulfilling of this text, and the sanctifying of an unbeliever to be the converting, or probability of converting him,—it is plain he understood it as those foregoing. All these bring the baptism of infants into the explication of their holiness.

St. Chrysostom says * [298] a great deal of clean and unclean, without coming to any particular explication of what he means by it. He says, "That the woman might not fear being made unclean by the copulation, the apostle tells her, *the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife*, &c.; and then having shown why, though adultery is a reasonable cause of separation, yet idolatry or heathenism is not, he adds, "Then there is given a proof of this; for on supposition that thou being unclean didst bring forth a child; and that child being not from thee alone, the child would be unclean, or but half clean; and, therefore, he adds, *Else were your children unclean, but now they are holy, i. e.* not unclean; but he uses the word *holy*, by an over-reaching

* In loc.

expression, that he might farther dispel all fear of any such suspicion, viz. of uncleanness."

This is something obscure; but he seems to make no more out of this text than the Antipædobaptists do; yet it is plain that he could not mean, that, by this cleanness, the children would obtain salvation without baptism; because he so often and so plainly affirms the contrary, as I have shewed in ch. 14.

8. He that made the Commentaries ascribed to St. Ambrose, talks yet more slightly. He says, † "If the believing party stay with the other, the sign of the cross will be used in the house; and that is a sanctification of it; and that, if the believing party go away, and lie with others, it would be adultery; and the children so begotten would be unclean, because they would be bastards." He makes St. Paul's arguing to come to no more than this, Let the believing woman stay and sanctify the house and her unbelieving husband with the sign of the cross; for if she go from him, and lie with others, the children so begotten would be bastards. —Who doubts it?

I know not at what year to place this author, for these Commentaries are pieced out of several authors, some elder, some later. This I believe was a later one.

9. Theodoret * explains [323] "The unbelieving party is sanctified; that is, there is hopes of their salvation; but suppose either the man or the woman do persist in unbelief; yet the seed shall be saved." These last words he explains as Calvin has since done.

10. He that wrote the *Questiones ad Antiochum* that are among the works of Athanasius, explains *holy* by *shall be saved*; but he limits it expressly to such as are baptized. I give his words among the spurious pieces, in chap. 23.

These are all the interpretations of this text that I know of, given by the antients.

St. Austin in this book ‡ answers one more objection

† In loc. * In loc. ‡ Cap. 10.

of Pelagius, which is this: — 'If the soul be not derived from the parents, but the body only, how comes the soul to be involved in the guilt of original sin?'

He answers, 1, That Pelagius had spoke like a circumspect man, when he put that with an *if*; for that it is an obscure matter, and not to be resolved from Scripture whether the soul be derived, or immediately created; — and, 2, He bids him answer this question first, "If the soul be not derived, what justice is it that a soul newly created, and void of all guilt, wholly free from all contagion of sin, should in infants suffer several passions and torturings of the body, and which is more dreadful, the outrage of evil spirits?" He advises, that since we see this by experience to be so, and yet cannot answer for the reason or justice of it, we should in all such questions remember that we are but men.

Having made so large an abstract of what St. Austin says of this matter in these three books, which were his first work against the Pelagians, I may have liberty to pass by a great many sayings in his following books against them; for it were endless to recite all the passages which we meet with in them, speaking of infant baptism, and proving from it original sin. I shall, therefore, mention only here and there one, and that only in English, for brevity.

The next year, *anno* 413, St. Hierom wrote his epistle to Ctesiphon (epist. 120) against that opinion of the Pelagians, which denies the need we have of God's grace; wherein he mentions not Pelagius by name, but means him, when he says "Speak out that which you hold; declare publicly what you talk in private to your disciples. This is the only heresy that is ashamed to speak only what it teaches privately. The forwardness of the disciples publishes that which the masters keep in. What they hear in the chambers, they proclaim on the house-top." He instances, in some passages of a book published by one of the disciples, which was probably Celestius; for Pelagius being of more refined politics, generally forebore to appear himself, and put

this Irishman foremost. They called the book *Syllogysms*; but St. Hierom says it ought to be called *Solecisms*. It had in it such sayings as these: —

"It is in vain that God has given me the power of free-will, if I cannot put it in practice without his continual help.

"I do either use the power once given me, so as that free-will is preserved; or else, if I stand in need of another's help, the freedom of will is destroyed in me.

"If I have a mind to bend my finger, stir my hand, sit, stand, walk, run, spit, blow my nose, ease myself, make water, — what! shall the help of God be always necessary for me?"

This St. Hierom calls *Blasphemy* and *Sacrilege*; and says,

"What venom of heretics does not this surpass! — They maintain that, by reason of the freedom of their will, they have no farther need of God!"

He has nothing here of original sin, and so not of infants. He promised a larger work, in which he would refute all their errors, which he performed two years after [§14].

The next year St. Austin wrote a large and elaborate letter in answer to one he had received out of Sicily, from Hilarius. It is to be noted, that Celestius, after his being condemned in Africa, or else in going from Rome to Africa, had made his abode for some time in Sicily; and had, as it seems, sowed the seeds of his heresy there; for Hilarius desired St. Austin's judgment concerning some "new doctrine, which (says he) * some Christians at Syracuse do publish: —

"1. That a man may be without sin, and keep God's commandments easily, if he will.

"2. That an unbaptized infant, surprized with death, cannot perish deservedly, because he is born without sin.

"3. That a rich man, if he keep his wealth, and do

* Inter Epistolas Augustini, epist. 88.

not sell all that he has, cannot enter into the kingdom of God; and it will not avail him that he uses his riches well [*or according to the Commandments.*]

"4. That one must not swear at all.

"5. Whether the church, of which it is written, *not having spot or wrinkle*, be that in which we now live, or that which we hope for; for some think it is this church which consists of present persons," &c.

To the second of these St. Austin (epist. 89) answers,

"Whereas they say 'An unbaptized infant cannot perish, because he is born without sin.' The apostle does not say so; and I suppose it is better to believe the apostle than them; for that teacher of the Gentiles, in whom Christ speaks, says (Rom. v. 12, &c.) *By one man sin entered into the world, &c.; for judgment was by one offence to condemnation; but the grace is of many offences to justification*; therefore, if they can find any infant that is not sprung from the concupiscence of that one man, of such an one let them say, That he is not liable to that condemnation, nor needs, by the grace of Christ, to be delivered from it.

"What means *by one offence to condemnation?* but by that one offence in which Adam offended? — and what means *of many offences to justification?* but that the grace of Christ does take off, not only that offence with which infants, sprung from that one man, are held bound, — but also the many offences which, when they are grown men, they add to it by wicked practices; but still that one, to which the carnal offspring that derives from that first man is liable, is, he says, enough for their condemnation; therefore, the baptism of infants is no more than what is necessary, that they who, by their generation, are subject to that condemnation, may, by regeneration, be freed from it; and as there is not a person in the world who is carnally generated but from Adam, — so neither is any spiritually regenerated but by Christ. The carnal generation is liable to that one offence, and the condemnation thereof; but the spiritual regeneration takes away not only that one for which infants are baptized, but also those many which men, by

wicked living, have added to that in which they are generated.

"And, therefore, he goes on, and says, *If by one man's offence Death reigned by one, much more they which receive the abundance of grace shall reign, &c. therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came on all men to condemnation, so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came on all men to justification of life; for, as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so, by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous.*

"What will they say to this?—or, What is possible for them to say, unless they will plead that the apostle is mistaken? That chosen vessel, the teacher of the Gentiles, that trumpet of Christ, proclaims *Judgment came by one to condemnation*; and these proclaim, on the contrary, and say That infants, who, as they confess, derive from that one man of whom he speaks, do not go into condemnation, though they be not baptized.

Judgment (says he) *came by* one *to condemnation.* "By one, what does he mean, but by *one* offence?—Since it follows, But the grace is of many offences to justification."

Then he answers to that plea of theirs, by which they said that St. Paul, by *one* offence, meant both the sin of Adam, and also all the sins which men, by imitating that, do commit.

He shews, that if St. Paul had meant so, he would have said in like manner of the grace of Christ, that *that* was of *one* offence to justification; but he distinguishes, and says, "Condemnation came by *one* offence; but the grace of Christ justifies from many offences."

Afterwards he says, "If, as they pretend, the apostle had said these things on this account, that we should understand sinners to belong to that first man, not that we derive sin by being born of him, but imitating him, he would rather have named the Devil; for he sinned first, and from him mankind do not derive their pedigree, but only they imitate him; and if it were on account of imitation that the apostle named the first man, because he was the

first sinner among men, and for that reason all sinful men were said to belong to him, Why did he not name Abel as the second man, who was the first righteous among men? But he names Adam, and on the other part names none but Christ; because as the one, a man, did by his sin defile his posterity, — so the other, God and man, did by his righteousness save his inheritance, — the one by transferring [*or conveying*] the defilement of the flesh, which the Devil, though wicked, could not; the other by giving the grace of his Spirit, which Abel, though righteous, could not."

He at last observes to Hilarius, that Celestius had been condemned for this doctrine at Carthage two years before; and tells him that himself had published some books, and had preached oftentimes against it, and had recovered several: that there were still some at Carthage that held that opinion; but privately: that, in many places, there were more of them than one would expect. "And where they are not refuted, they seduce others to their sect; and are grown so numerous, that I know not what it will come to; but we wish rather that they should be healed in the unity of the church, than that they should be cut off from the body of it as incurable members, provided necessity do not compel it; for there is some fear lest more limbs do putrify, whilst the putrified ones are spared," &c.

The third and fourth positions of the Pelagians about a rich man, and about swearing, are such as may possibly raise the reader's curiosity to know what was said to those questions in these times,

To the third, St. Austin observes, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were rich, and continued so, and yet have a place in the kingdom; that the rich man in the parable did not go into torment because he died rich; but because he was luxurious, and unmerciful to Lazarus; that Lazarus, when he died, was carried into the bosom of a rich man, &c.

And whereas the Pelagians pretended that the selling of all is necessary, under the New Testament, though not under the Old; he observes that our Saviour, who

set the rich young man this condition of being perfect (*sell that thou hast*, &c.); yet did not set this as the condition of entering into life; but that other (Mat. xix. 17, 21) *Keep the commandments*; that the apostle teaching rich men how *to lay hold* (1 Tim. vi. 17, 18, 19) *on eternal life*, bids them *do good, distribute, communicate*, &c.; but does not require them to sell all.

But to the argument which they raised from these words of our Saviour (Mat. xix. 23) *A rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of Heaven*, &c. St. Austin makes no answer, but what seems defective. "How is it then (says he) does the apostles speak contrary to the Lord?—or, Do these men not understand what they talk of?" He refers them to Christ's following words, *With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible.* Those they explained thus, as he tells us, "Christ knew that several rich men, upon hearing the gospel, would sell their estates and give them to the poor, &c. and so that would be done which seemed so difficult,—not that any of them, continuing in their wealth, would, by keeping those rules of the apostle, lay hold on eternal life; but that selling all that they had, they would so fulfil those rules of the apostle.'

Here St. Austin observes, That, according to this their own interpretation, "our Lord does, contrary to their tenet, set forth his own grace; for he does not say 'That which seems to you impossible is easy for men to do, if they will;'—but he says 'That which is impossible with men, is easy with God.' And following on that point, he forgets to return and give any answer how he himself would have those words of our Saviour to be understood. Only he observes, that the apostle's words could not be so meant as they explained them, viz. of selling all they had; because he gives several rules how they should provide for their servants, children, &c. which is not consistent with selling all they had; "for (as he observes) how can this be done without a house, and something to keep it?"

Our Saviour seems in that saying, *A rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of God*, to have meant,

as he does in many other places, by the *kingdom of Heaven*, and the *kingdom of God*, not the kingdom of Glory; but the state of the profession of the gospel, and of faith in him, as it was at that time, when both himself and all that would be his disciples, were so persecuted, that they could not think of keeping any estate if they had it; and as things so stood, it was very hard to persuade any rich man to enter into it; so hard, that, humanly speaking, it was impossible: only God, by the power of his grace might overcome that love of their wealth, which hindered them from owning Christ. — Now that difficulty is not at all times, but only in times of persecution.

If this be the sense, the translation would be more intelligible if it were said, not *shall hardly*, but *will hardly enter*, &c.

If this be the sense, then what St. Austin answers is pertinent and full, *viz.* that there are many rich men who, though they do not actually sell all, and give to the poor, yet are ready to part with all, if occasion should be, for the sake of Christ and his truth; and who, in the mean time, do keep their families in Christian discipline, use hospitality and beneficence to the poor, receive a righteous man in the name of a righteous man, &c.; and he takes notice that Pelagius himself was relieved in his necessities by such rich men, and entertained by them (and others speak of him as a great haunter of such men's houses); he says,

"These men, if they expect to be such as the apostle speaks of * *that shall judge angels*, ought to resolve before hand *to receive* † *into everlasting habitations those that have made them their friends with the mammon of unrighteousness.* Those servants of God, who, having sold all, do afterwards live upon the honest labour of their own hands, may, with much less imprudence, condemn men from whom they receive nothing, than those that not being able by reason of some infir-

* 1 Cor. vi. 3. † Luke xvi. 9.

mity to work with their hands, do condemn the men that maintain them. — I that write this, was greatly in love with that perfection of which our Lord spoke, when he said to the rich man *Go, and sell all*, &c.; and I did so, not by my own strength, but by his assisting grace; and though I was not rich, there will nevertheless be imputed to me for that; for the apostles themselves, that did this first, were no rich men; but he parts with all the world that parts with all that he has, or hopes to have; and I do my utmost endeavour to persuade others to this purpose; and I have, in the name of God, several partners, who have by my ministry been brought to it; but still so, as that the sound doctrine is preserved among us; and that we do not in way of vainglory censure those that do not take the same course; and tell them, that it will not avail them to live chastely in matrimony, to order their houses and families Christian-like," &c.

I think this to be a modest and handsome rebuke of the pride of those two monks, who valued themselves so much upon their selling their temporal possessions, that they censured all that did not do the like, as incapable of God's kingdom. St. Austin shews that he and several others had done the same with less noise, and less spiritual pride and censure.

To the fourth, about swearing, he says thus: — "Avoid swearing as much as is possible; for it is better not to swear, even to the truth, than, by a custom of swearing, to fall often into perjury, and always to come in danger of it; but these men, as far as appears by what I have heard some of them talk, do not know what is swearing; for they think they do not swear when they say *God knows*, or *God is witness*, or *I call God to witness upon my soul*; because it is not said *By God*; and because such phrases as the forementioned are found in the apostle Paul; but even that phrase, which they confess to be swearing, is found in him, when he says * *By your rejoicing, which I have*

* 1 Cor. v. 31.

in Christ Jesus our Lord; for, in the Greek, this plainly appears to be swearing; so that one cannot take those words in the Latin (*per vestram gloriam*) "by your rejoicing,' as those † (*per meum adventum iterum ad vos*) 'by my coming to you again;' and many such like, where it is said *By any thing*, and yet there is no swearing, are to be taken."

"But because the apostle, a man most strong in the truth, swore in his epistles, we must not therefore make a sport of swearing. As for us, it is much safer, as I said, never to swear; but to make use of *Yes, yes*, and *No, no*, as our Lord advises, — not that it is a sin to swear truly; but it is a most dreadful sin to swear falsely; into which he naturally falls that accustoms himself to swear."—This is St. Austin's sense; and whereas some of the antienter fathers are against all swearing,—there was a particular reason in their time; because all the oaths then administered in courts were by the Heathen gods, or the genii of the emperors.

The instance that he gives of St. Paul's swearing, is the plainest in the Scripture; for whereas the Latin language uses the word *per*, as the English the word *by*, to many other purposes, as well as swearing; the Greek, as St. Austin observes, has a peculiar word (νὴ) for *by*, in the case of swearing by any thing, and which is never used but in swearing; as νὴ Διά, and νὴ τὰς Θεὰς; and so νὴ τὰς ὑμετέραν καύχησιν, is, without any more addition, '*I swear* [for which our English have put *I* '*protest*] by your glory, [*or rejoicing*] which I have 'in Christ Jesus our Lord,' *i. e.* by that which is our common Christian hope and joy.

There came the same year some more questions out of Sicily for St. Austin to resolve, from Eutropius and Paulus. They sent him a paper, entitled *Definitiones, ut dicuntur, Celestii*, 'Arguments given out, as is said, by Celestius.'

It contained fourteen arguments, or rather one argument diversified in words fourteen times, to prove that a

† Phil. i. 26.

man may be without sin if he will. That argument is no other than this dilemma: "God's commands are either possible or impossible," &c.

It might be worth the while of a young sophister to read them for a pattern, to see how many ways that fallacy may be varied; as "Sin is either a thing that may be avoided, or that cannot be avoided," &c.; — "Sin is either a thing of will, or of necessity," &c.; but they are not worth reciting here. St. Austin recites them, and gives particular answers to each of them *: that a man may, by God's grace, have in general a will, desire, and aim to avoid all sin; but, by reason of our frailty, no man finds that purpose to hold out so steady in all particulars, but that he often slips, and sometimes falls. Neither does it do us any good to prove how unblameable we should be on supposition that our will were faultless, since our greatest blemish is the corrupt inclination of our will itself, which complies with the temptations in all men at sometimes and to some degree; but in men destitute of God's grace, so far as to yield the dominion to sin; and since this is too plain experience, what do sophisms to the contrary avail us? Our business is to get cure by God's grace for this distemper, not to dispute ourselves out of the sense of it.

About this time [314] Pelagius wrote one of his most elaborate pieces, entitled *Of the Abilities of Nature*; to which St. Austin, next year [314], wrote an answer, entitled *Of Nature and Grace*. He owns (cap. 6) that Pelagius had shewn an example of a *most strong and nimble wit*, and had well reproved those that excuse their wickedness by laying all the fault of it on the nature of man; but that he had carried this zeal too far, in saying that men that are wicked might have been sinless, if they would; and, "That if they were sinners because they could not be otherwise, they are not to be blamed." On which St. Austin makes this remark (cap. 7) "Mind what he says. Now I say that an infant, born and surprized with death in such a place where he cannot be re-

* Lib. de Perfectione Justitiæ ad Eutropium.

lieved by the baptism of Christ, is as he is (viz. dies without the washing of regeneration) because he could be no otherwise. Let him then absolve such a one, and set open the kingdom of Heaven to him, in spite of our Lord's declaration," &c.

Among several arguments as good as the case would bear, Pelagius there uses one very silly logical quirk. In opposition to what the church held of our nature in the state in which it now is, viz. That it is depraved and weakened by sin, he said, * "What is sin? Is it any substantial thing? — or a name without any substance, by which is meant not any real thing, not any existence, not any bodily thing, — but the act of something done amiss? And how can that which has no substance weaken or change human nature?"

St. Austin produces the instance of some godly man, crying out as it is (Ps. xli. 4) *Lord be merciful to me, heal my soul, for I have sinned against thee, &c.* He bids Pelagius ask such a man "What he ails? What is sin? — Is it a substance? &c. How can a thing that has no substance defile thy soul?" &c. And then adds, "Would not the man, in the bitterness of his soul, bid him begone?" &c. You see whither this argument tends, and to what it would lead us, — to think those words spoken to no purpose, *Thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins;* for how shall he save them if they have no ailing? Sins, from which the Gospel says Christ's people are to be saved, are no substances, and so cannot defile. Oh, brother, it were a good thing if you would remember that you are a Christian," &c.

Pelagius proved that men may be without sin, by instancing † in a great many persons who had been so, as he pretended; — Abel, Enoch, Melchisedeck, and twenty more; and in some women, — Deborah, Anna, Judith, &c. and also the mother of our Lord and Saviour; concerning whom he said, "That it is necessary

* Apud Augustin. de Natura et Gratia, cap. 19.
† Ibid. cap. 36.

for our religion that we do confess her to be without sin."

St. Austin answers, "Excepting the holy Virgin Mary, concerning whom I am not willing, for the honour of our Lord, to hold any dispute at all when we are talking about sin (*unde enim scimus quod* [*l. quid*] *ei plus gratiæ collatum fuerit ad vincendum omni ex parte peccatum, quæ concipere et parere meruit eum quem constat nullum habuisse peccatum? Hac ergo excepta virgine*); 'for how do we know that [*or what*] more 'grace was bestowed on her to overcome all sin, who 'had the honour to conceive and bring forth him who 'certainly had no sin? But (this virgin excepted) if we 'could have called together all those holy men and women when they were alive, and have asked them Whether they were without sin? -- what do you think they 'would have said? As this man says, or as the apostle 'John says? They would all have cried out with one 'voice, *If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves*,' &c.

From what the Papists now-a-days say and practise, in reference to the blessed Virgin, one would think that all antiquity had believed her to be sinless; but, by examining, we shall find that Pelagius here is the first that ever said that she was without sin. St. Austin indeed makes a very modest answer, as thinking it decent for us, in regard to the honour of our Saviour, not to hold any talk about the sins of his mother; but as one may guess by this place, and more plainly by some other, he was far from affirming her to be sinless. He often speaks positively of all mankind as sinful, excepting only our Saviour Christ; and for other fathers, they make no scruple, when it comes in their way, to speak particularly of her failings; as Chrysostom on John ii. 3; and St. Hierom (Dialog. 1) having repeated her *Canticum*, bids Pelagius mark, that "she does not call herself *blessed* for any merit or virtue of her own; but by the mercy of God, who vouchsafed to inhabit in her."

Aquinas having produced, by way of objection against

himself, several reasons and some authorities, that she had sin *, answers them all with that text (Cant. iv. 7) *Thou art all fair, my love — there is no spot in thee*; and with this passage of St. Austin. Now this is not to his purpose as it stands here; but in Aquinas's citation the words are altered. He reads them thus: *Inde enim scimus quod ei plus gratiæ collatum fuerit ad vincendum omni ex parte peccatum, quod concipere, &c.* 'For we know that more grace was bestowed on her to 'overcome all sin, by this; that she had the honour to 'conceive [or deserved to conceive]' &c. But the Jesuit Vasquez had something more of honesty; for though he would have the words read as Aquinas reads them; yet he confesses that he found them in the book as I have transcribed them. He quotes † *unde enim*; but adds as of his own, or rather *inde enim*; and he quotes *quid ei plus gratiæ;* but says, as of his own head, or rather, *quod ei plus gratiæ*; and the word *quæ* he does not pretend to alter into *quod* at all.

The edition that Vasquez had was more unexceptionable, and gives even less occasion to the Popish alterations than that out of which I transcribe, which is Erasmus's, printed at Venice, 1551 (and his editions are commonly the least tainted with their corruptions of the text); for Vasquez reads *quid*, which, together with the sense of the discourse there, justifies my alteration. If there were not some eye kept over these men, they would both in the fathers, and in the Scripture too, alter the words as some of them have done here, to serve their turn.

They had better take Pelagius's words, which serve their purpose without any alteration; it would not be the first time they have borrowed from some heretic a doctrine which was never owned in the ancient Catholic Church. Pelagius does not only say she was sinless, but makes it a necessary point of religion to believe so; which fits them to a hair.

---

* Aq. Summ. 3, Q. 27, Art. 3, 4.
† In tertiam Thomæ, t. 2, Disp. 117, c. 3.

Pelagius lived all this while at Jerusalem; but what he wrote was in Latin; so that his opinions were more talked of in the west, where he had lived, and where that language was understood and spoken, than in the east, where he now was; because little but Greek was read or spoken there.

He could not have found a more convenient retreat than at Jerusalem; for John, the bishop there, with whom he lived, was himself addicted to new opinions. Both Epiphanius and St. Hierom had a good while before wrote against him for holding several of the condemned opinions of Origen, — to which some of Pelagius's tenets were pretty near a-kin.

About this time there happened a meeting of bishops at Jerusalem; and Orosius, a young man, who had been with St. Austin, and was now at Bethlehem with St. Hierom, came to this meeting; and declared to them what a noise there was in the west about some doctrines published by Celestius [315], and countenanced by some writings of Pelagius, and that St. Austin had wrote against them; and he caused * to be read to them (as well as could be done by an interpreter) St. Austin's letter to Hilarius, mentioned before. Pelagius being asked whether he had taught those doctrines against which St. Austin there writes, answered, "Who is that Austin? [or, what is Austin to me?"] Some in the council answered, 'He that speaks against that bishop, by whose means God has restored unity to all Africa, deserves to be turned out, not only from this assembly, but from the whole church.'

They referred to the service St. Austin had done in reducing the Donatists.

Bishop John, who presided, interposed for him; and all that was urged against him, at that time, being this, That he had maintained that a man might live without sin, — John said, "If he had maintained this to be possible without God's help, it were a thing to be condemned; but since he adds that, what have you to say?

* Orosij Apologetic.

Do you deny God's help?" So a squabble arising, and Orosius, who could speak no Greek, as they no Latin, not being able to make them understand the fallacy which Pelagius concealed under that word *God's help*, the issue was, that the matter should be referred to Innocent, Bishop of Rome; and that in the mean time Pelagius should keep silence; and so nothing at this meeting was said about original sin; and John, the bishop, took occasion quickly after to fall out with Orosius; upon which he wrote his *Apologetic*, which is still extant, and out of which some quotations to our purpose, about infant baptism, might be taken; but they have nothing different from what St. Austin, St. Hierom, and Pelagius himself have; and, therefore, I shall for brevity omit them.

About the latter end of this year 415 [315] there was another assembly of fourteen bishops in this country, at the town which, in Scripture, is called *Lydda*, but was then called *Diospolis*, to which Pelagius was summoned; and there he could come off no other way but by denying several of his opinions, which he had promoted before; and which (as St. Austin makes appear) he for all this denial continued to promote afterward.

The articles objected to him were taken partly out of some books of his own; partly out of some books of Celestius, who was looked on as his scholar; and partly out of the Acts of a Council at Carthage, where Celestius had been condemned; and partly out of that catalogue of new opinions which Hilarius had sent to St. Austin out of Sicily, and which St. Austin refuted in the forementioned letter.

Of what was cited from his own books, he denied part; and said the book was not writ by him, though it went under his name. The rest he defended, and put as fair a colour on as he could; which was easy to do, because what he had wrote in Latin (which these bishops did not understand) he explained * to them in Greek (for he did not speak to them by an interpreter, as Mr.

* Aug. de Gestis Palæst. c. 2.

Le Clerc mistakes the matter); and because his accusers were not there, being sick; but only their libel was read.

But he himself had been wary in his expressions, for what Celestius had. Of the articles taken from the books or words of Celestius he defended some, as "The Possibility of avoiding all Sin, by God's help," &c.; but renounced the rest, in these words, * "The other things, as they confess themselves, were not spoken by me; and so I have no reason to answer for them; yet, for the satisfaction of the holy Synod, I do renounce [*anathematize*] all that do hold so;" — so he goes off with a whole skin; but left several of his beloved opinions behind him condemned, as appears by minding which those were that he renounced.

The account of the whole is long, especially of those articles which bore a dispute in what sense he had spoke or understood them. What is most material to give us the sense of the church at that time, is, to recite those which the council condemned, and he was forced to condemn; which you have in the words of St. Austin, in his letter to Paulinus †, expressed much shorter than in the book *De Gestis Palæst.* (where the acts of this council are at large recited) but to the same effect. — He writes thus: —

"For beside those articles which he ventured to defend as well as he could, some things were objected to him, which, unless he had renounced [*anathematized*] he would have been renounced himself.

"For it was objected, that he said [*or held*],

"1. That Adam, whether he had sinned or not, would have died.

"2. That his sin hurt himself only, and not mankind.

"3. That infants new born are in the same state that Adam was before his fall.

"4. That neither by the death or fall of Adam does

* August. eodem libro. † Epist. 106.

all mankind die; nor by the resurrection of Christ does all mankind arise."

These you see are the same that had been objected to Celestius four years before.

"5. That infants, though they be not baptized, have eternal life.

"6. That rich men, unless they part with all, &c. cannot have the kingdom of God."

These two were taken out of the heads of new doctrine, broached at Syracuse.

"7. That the grace of God is not given in every action, but is in free-will, or in the law and doctrine."

And several other articles about grace and merit.

"All these Pelagius did so renounce [*anathematizavit*] as the acts of the council do shew, that he did not produce any thing in defence of them. From whence it follows, that whosoever will own the authority of that episcopal judgment, and the confession of Pelagius himself, must hold these things (which the Catholic Church has ever held) viz.

"That Adam, if he had not sinned, would not have died:

"That his sin hurt, not himself only, but mankind:

"That infants new born are not in the state that Adam was before his fall, &c.:

"That unbaptized infants will miss, not only of the kingdom of Heaven, but also of eternal life." &c.

Though this must needs have cost Pelagius a sore pang; yet so it happened, that the news of his being acquitted in this council made more noise among the vulgar people to his advantage, than his being compelled to renounce those opinions did against his cause, especially in the west, where they heard he was acquitted and approved; but did not hear upon what terms. He himself also published accounts of the matter to his own advantage *, and triumphed of his success; so that the

* Aug. de Gestis Palæstin. c. 30.

Pelagians were never more uppish than they were for a while after this Synod.

And yet, upon the whole matter, though St. Austin does often speak of these bishops, as having been imposed on by Pelagius in matter of fact; and do shew how he disguised and concealed his true meaning from them; and though he do, in a letter which he a little while after this wrote to John, Bishop of Jerusalem, desiring him to send a copy of the acts of the council, say thus, * "As for Pelagius, our brother and your son, whom I hear you love very well, I advise you so to manage your love to him, that they that know him, and have attentively heard him, may not judge your Holiness to be imposed on by him, &c.; for when you hear him confess the grace and help of God, you think he means the same that you do, who have a Catholic sense of it, because you don't know what he has wrote in his book; and for that reason I have sent you his book, and mine written in answer to it;" and though St. Hierom do on this account call this Synod † *The pitiful Synod of Diospolis*; yet, I say, upon the whole matter, it appears by the acts of this council, that these bishops, though, as St. Austin says, ‡ "They could not thoroughly examine the man; yet, for the heresy itself, they gave it a deadly wound;" — for by forcing Pelagius to declare what he did about the sin of Adam, the natural state of infants, and the necessity of God's grace, and the renouncing of merit, they shewed that they were far enough from Pelagianism; so that St. Austin says, § That when he read the acts of this council, and before he saw Pelagius's books of *Free-Will*, wherein he returned to his vomit again, he thought "that this question had been at an end; and that Pelagius had plainly owned original sin in infants."

This I note the rather, because some among us now-a-days that shew a good will to Pelagianism, and do strangely shuffle with that 9th article of the Church of

* Epist. 252.
† Hieronym. Epist. 79.
‡ De Gestis Pal. c. 21.
§ Lib. de Peccato Origin, c. 14.

England, which is of original sin, expounding it all away, do shelter themselves under the pretended authority of the Greek Church, as if the Greek fathers had not owned that doctrine: whereas not only this council that acquitted Pelagius, yet condemned the opinions laid to his charge, but also the other councils of the eastern nations agreed with the Latins in condemning the said doctrines, and the men too, when it appeared that they really held such doctrines.

For, three years after this, Theodotus, bishop of Antioch, held a synod at Jerusalem, to which Pelagius was cited and there condemned, as is recorded by *Marius Mercator. Commonitor. c.* 3.

And some time after, Julian the Pelagian, with seventeen more of his party, wrote to the bishop of Thessalonica, representing their own doctrine in the fairest colours, and that of the Catholics in the west in the blackest, hoping to make a party in the Greek Church*; but found none, or hardly any, that they could bring over.

Celestius, before his condemnation at Rome, went to Constantinople to try if any interest could be made there: but Atticus, the bishop there, would neither receive him nor his doctrine†. St. Austin mentions this in short, *lib.* 3. *contra Julian. c.* 1. But Mercator more at large, *Commonitor. c.* 1. Some years after he went to Constantinople, in the time of Atticus of holy memory, where, being discovered to hold such opinions, he was by the great care of that holy man driven from that city; and letters were sent concerning him into Asia, to Thessalonica, and Carthage, to the bishops there, of which I have copies ready to be produced: but the said Celestius being driven from hence also, went to Rome, &c.

At Ephesus also they were rejected and disowned, not suffered to abide there, which is the word of Prosper, who relates this *lib. de ingratis, c.* 2. But Mr. Le Clerc expresses it *ill treated.*

---

* August. ad Bonifac. l. 1, c. 1. † Acta Concil. Ephes. Pt. 1. c. 18.

The only hopeful attempt they ever made in the Greek Church [331] was about fifteen years after this time; when a general council being called to Ephesus on account of Nestorius (who had innovated in the doctrine of the incarnation) they joined their party with his, as is usual for discontented parties to do, and made in all, at first forty-three, but quickly dwindled to thirty, as appears by the address of the council to the Emperor, where they say, "It is an absurd thing that thirty men only (some of whom had been a good while ago deposed, some are of the false opinion of Celestius, &c.) should set themselves against a Synod of 210 Bishops, with whom all the western bishops (and so the whole world) do consent. They made also Canons*, that if any clergyman did publicly or privately promote the opinions of Nestorius, or Celestius, they should be deprived.

These things, and more to the same purpose, are largely and particularly quoted out of the acts of that council, by Bishop Usher, in the forementioned treatise †; so that it is hard to guess what these men get by appealing to the Greek Church.

And for the Greek fathers before this time, Vossius has largely shewn in his Pelagian History that they commonly teach the doctrine of original sin; only he thinks Clemens Alexandrinus must be excepted; but Dr. Hammond shews ‡ that there is no reason for that exception. Vossius is of opinion that there is no difference between St. Austin and the ancient Greek fathers about that other point of predestination; but that § what the ancienter fathers omitted concerning predestination he adds: but, allowing that to be a matter in which men will always pass various judgments, and will find each their own sentiments both in the Scripture and the fathers, it cannot with any modesty at all be pretended that they do not own and complain of original sin, or natural corruption. It is true that most of them were of opinion that this corruption or sin should in unbaptized infants

* Can. 4. † Cap. xi. ‡ Annot. on Ps. 51.
§ De Historicis Latinis, lib. 2. c. 1.

be punished no otherwise than by the loss of the kingdom of Heaven: and in this indeed they differed from most of the Latins.

Mr. Le Clerc says* "They that have not so ill an opinion of Pelagius as St. Austin had, do say that if St. Austin had been able to read the Greek doctors, he would have found that they speak no otherwise than Pelagius does, as may (says he) be seen in a great many places in St. Chrysostom, and in Isidore of Pelusium, whom some moderns have openly accused of Pelagianism."

By singling out St. Chrysostom, he follows the steps of the old Pelagians; for it appears out of St. Austin's books against Julian the Pelagian, *lib.* 1. and *lib.* 3, that he and Anianus do make their chief boast of St. Chrysostom, and do fetch more for their purpose out of him than out of any other Greek writer. They translated some of his Orations that were most for their turn; and St. Austin, though not very conversant indeed in the Greek language, yet shewed that he could read and tolerably understand it by giving instances wherein they had made them more for their purpose than they were by their translation, as I recited before in ch. 14.; and besides, he answered them by producing other places of his, where he plainly owns original sin.

And for other Greek doctors who were more to be regarded (for St. Chrysostom was no ancienter than St. Austin himself) he shews the doctrine of Irenæus, St. Basil, St. Gregory, &c. to have been clear and full in this matter; and says, † though he had a translation of the sermon of St. Basil, which he quoted ‡, yet he chose rather to translate it himself word for word out of the Greek, that it might be more exact. The like he does in the same book with two passages of St. Chrysostom, setting down the Greek words; so that the foresaid censure past on him has more in it of the assuming humour of a critic than it has of truth or good manners.

* Bib. Univers. t. 8. p. 192. † Lib. 1. contra Julian.
‡ Sermo de Jejunio.

And to expect of St. Austin that he should have read Isidore to know the sense of the Greek Church, is (if one consider the age of each) a jest indeed.

I gave some instances above, in ch. 14, where both St. Chrysostom, and this Isidore, and also Theodoret (for they all run in one vein, and the two latter shew a great ambition to imitate the former) have expressions something like those of Pelagius about infant baptism, viz. That infants are baptized though they have no sins; where yet it appears by circumstances that their meaning was only that they had no actual ones.

About the same time that the Synod of Diospolis was held, St. Hierom published his three books against the opinions of Pelagius (not naming him, but sufficiently decyphering him) in form of Dialogues between a Pelagian and a Catholic, under the feigned names of Atticus and Critobulus; Atticus representing the Catholic, and Critobulus the Pelagian. The far greatest part of them (which I must omit) is taken up in setting forth the pride and presumption of that tenet of Pelagius, that a man may in this life be without sin, which had been so smartly done by Atticus, that toward the end of the third dialogue, Critobulus reckoning that he could maintain this to be true in the case of infants at least, if not of grown persons, says thus: —

Crit. "I can hold no longer; all my patience is overcome by your provoking way of talk. I pray tell me wherein have infants sinned? neither can the conscience of any fault, nor can their ignorance be imputed to them, who, according to that of the prophet Jonah, know not their right hand from their left. They are in no ease to commit sin, and yet they are in a case to perish: their knees double under them; their tender age can utter no words; with a mouth that would speak if it could they give a smile; and the torment of eternal misery is prepared for the poor babes."

Att. "Oh! you are grown mighty eloquent, &c. — But do not run upon me with your flowers of rhetoric (which are none of your own neither) with which

the ears of boys and shallow men are wont to be caught, but tell me plainly what you would say of them."

Crit. "This I say, grant me but this, that they at least who cannot sin are without sin."

Att. "I shall grant it, provided they be baptized in Christ; and yet you shall not bring me to yield to your proposition That a person may be without sin if he will: these have neither power nor will, but they are free from all sin by the grace of God, which they receive in baptism."

Crit. "You will force me to come to that invidious question, and to say What sin had they? that you may make the people presently throw stones at me; and that when you cannot murder me by strength, you may by a device."

Att. "He murders a heretic that suffers him to continue such," &c.

Crit. "Tell me, I beseech you, and free me from all doubt — For what reason are infants baptized?"

Att. "That in baptism their sins may be forgiven."

Crit. "What sin have they incurred? Is any one loosed that never was bound?"

Att. "Do you ask me? That trumpet of the gospel, that teacher of the Gentiles, that golden vessel shining through all the world, shall answer you, *Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, which is the figure of him that was to come,* &c. [he goes on to recite the fifth chapter to the Romans]. And if you object that it is said that there were some that had not sinned, understand it that they sinned not that sin which Adam committed in Paradise by breaking God's command: but all persons are held obnoxious, either by their own or by their forefather Adam's sin. He that is an infant is in baptism loosed from the bond of his forefather: he that is of age to understand, is by the blood of Christ freed both from his own bond and also from that which is derived from another."

"And that you may not think that I understand this in an heretical [*or heterodox*] sense, the blessed martyr Cyprian (whom you pretend to have imitated in collecting into order some places of Scripture) in the epistle which he writes to Bishop Fidus, about the baptizing of infants, says thus: —

'If then the greatest offenders, and they that have grievously sinned against God before, have, when they afterwards come to believe, forgiveness of their sins; and no person is kept off from baptism and the grace,— how much less reason is there to refuse an infant, who, being newly-born, has no sin, save that being descended from Adam, according to the flesh, he has, from his very birth, contracted the contagion of the death anciently threatened,' &c.

He goes on to recite *verbatim* all the rest of the epistle to the end, which I recited before in chap. 6, and then proceeds: —

"That holy and accomplished person, Bishop Austin, wrote some time ago to Marcellinus (who was afterward, though innocent, put to death by the heretics, on pretence that he had a hand in Heraclius's usurpation) two books concerning the baptism of infants, against your heresy, by which you would maintain that infants are baptized, not for forgiveness of sins, but for the kingdom of Heaven, according to that which is written in the gospel, *Except a person be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of Heaven*; and a third book to the said Marcellinus, against those that say (what you say) that a man may, without the grace of God, be without sin, if he will; and a fourth to Hilarius, against your doctrine that brings up so many odd things; and, they say, he is setting out some more books particularly relating to you, which are not yet come to my hands; so that I think it proper for me to spare my pains on this subject, lest that of Horace be said to me, *Never carry timber into the woods*; for either I must superfluously say the same that

he has said, or else, if I would say any new things, his excellent wit has forestalled all the best.

"This one thing I will say, that this discourse may at last have an end, either you must set forth a new Creed, and after the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, baptize infants unto the *kingdom of Heaven*, — or else, if you acknowledge *one baptism* for infants and for grown persons, you must own that infants are to be baptized for forgiveness of sins, — sins after the similitude of Adam's transgression.

"And if the forgiveness of sins, which are the sins of another, do seem to you unjust, or such as he that could commit no sin himself has no need of, then march over to *your beloved**, who holds that in baptism are forgiven those old sins which have been committed in a former state in the celestial regions; and so as you are influenced by his authority in your other points, partake with his error in this too."

Though St. Hierom, after having in these dialogues largely confuted the other errors of Pelagius, do insist but briefly on this proof of original sin from the baptism of infants, as being a matter which had been fully handled by St. Austin in the books he here mentions, and of which I gave some account before; yet this little seems to have nettled and puzzled Pelagius more than all that was said by St. Austin. The Pelagians confessed that adult persons were baptized for *forgiveness of sins*; but infants having no sins, were baptized only for the *kingdom of Heaven*. This was to establish two sorts of baptism; which was contrary to that article of the Constantinopolitan Creed, then received in all the world: *I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins.* Pelagius could never get clear from this argument; and it appears by his answer, which we shall see presently, that he yielded more to the force of it than any other.

But in the mean time, and quickly after the Synod of Diospolis, he published four books (*pro libero arbi-*

* Origen.

trio) in Defence of Free-Will; in which, beside what he has about the point of God's grace, he does, as St. Austin expresses it, † "not by any sly intimation [*as formerly*] but in a most open manner, maintain by all the force of argument he can, that human nature, in infants, is in no manner polluted by derivation [*or birth*]." St. Austin gives there ‡ an instance of one of his sayings, in the first of the said four books.

"All the good or evil for which we are to be praised or blamed, does not come into the world with us, but is acted by us; for we are born capable of either of these, not full [*or possessed*] of either of them; and as we are at first formed without any virtue, so likewise without any vice; and there is in a person, before the actings of his own will, nothing but what God has created [*or put into him*]."

When people wondered how he could reconcile this with what he had said in the said Synod, where he had, as was shewed before, anathematized all that held any of these opinions: — "1, That Adam's sin hurt himself only, and not mankind; — 2, That infants new born are in the same state that Adam was before his fall; — 3, That infants, though not baptized, have eternal life," — he invented these salvoes, which St. Austin mentions in a book written some time after *, and which shew that he had a faculty of juggling, and equivocation enough for a Jesuit.

1. That it might be said truly enough That Adam's sin did hurt mankind as well as himself. But how? "Not by derivation, but by the ill example it gave." The Socinians may thank him for this explication; for it helps them to much such another about Christ's death doing good to mankind.

2. That infants new born are not in the same state that Adam was before his fall, is true enough; but for a reason very different from what those bishops, whom

† De Peccato Originali, cap. 21. ‡ Cap. 13.
* Ibid. c. 15.

he bantered, could imagine, viz. Because he was a man, and they are but children.

3. All the reason he could give for his condemning those that said "Unbaptized infants shall have eternal life," was a saying which he often had in his mouth, * "As for infants that die without baptism, I know whither they do not go; but whither they do go, I know not; *i. e.* I know they do not go to the kingdom of Heaven; but what becomes of them I know not."

It is plain enough, from many places in St. Austin, that his followers held, That they should have a certain eternal life, but not in the kingdom of Heaven; but he himself, it seems, at least at this time, to salve what he had said in the Synod, renounced those that determined so; and kept himself in reserve concerning their future state.

St. Austin's note on all this is, †. "Does he think that when these propositions were set him to condemn in one sense, he does, by expounding them in another sense, make it out, that he did not deceive his judges? So far from that, that he deceived them so much the more slily, as he now explains himself the more craftily."

The next year [316] two councils were held in Africa, both about the same time: one at Carthage, of sixty-eight bishops; the other at Milevis, for the province of Numidia, of sixty-one bishops. They had not then seen Pelagius's last four books, and had but an imperfect account of what had passed at Diospolis; but they found it necessary to condemn the Pelagian opinions, which had taken some footing in those countries, but much more at Rome; and, therefore, they both of them did, by synodical epistles written to Innocent, bishop of Rome, desire the concurrence of that church, — not that they thought their own decrees invalid without a confirmation from Rome; but because Rome was most infected. With which desire Innocent did very cordially comply in

* Aug. ib. c. 21. † Ibid. c. 16.

his answers; which answers, though written the year after, I shall recite here, leaving out, both in the epistles and answers, the greatest part, which is about grace; but inserting what they say about infants: —

"*The Synodical Epistle of the Council of Carthage to Innocent** [316].

They take notice of the report that Pelagius had been acquitted at the Council of Diospolis, by denying most of the tenets objected to him; and then say,

"If Pelagius do seem to your Reverence also justly acquitted by those episcopal acts which are said to have passed in the east, yet the error itself and the impiety which has so many abettors in several places, ought to be condemned by the authority of the apostolic see, — let your Holiness then consider, and have a fellow-feeling with us in your pastoral bowels, how mischievous and destructive a thing that is to the sheep of Christ, which follows from their sacrilegious disputations, That we need not *pray that we enter not into temptation*," &c.

They proceed to shew the necessity of praying for God's assisting grace, from Luke xxii. 32; Eph. iii. 14, &c.; and then conclude their letter thus; —

"They say also, 'That infants are not to be baptized for that salvation which is given by Christ as a Saviour; and so they kill them eternally by their pernicious doctrine. They maintain that, 'though they should not be baptized, yet they would have an eternal life; and that they are not of those of whom our Lord says *The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost*; for these, say they, were not lost, neither is there any thing in them that needs saving or redeeming at so great a price; for there is nothing in them that is corrupted, nothing that is held captive under the power of the Devil, nor was the blood which was shed for forgiveness of sins, shed for them.' Though Celestius has by his

* Apud Augustinum, epist. 90.

book, formerly * given into the Church of Carthage, owned that infants have redemption by the baptism of Christ; but a great many who are said to be, or to have been, their disciples, do not cease with all their might to uphold these evils, by which they endeavour to overthrow the Christian faith.

"So that suppose Pelagius and Celestius be reformed, or do say that they never held these things, and do deny that any of the writings produced against them are theirs, and the contrary cannot be proved; yet in the general, whoever maintains these tenets, and does affirm That human nature can be sufficient of itself to overcome sin, and keep God's commandments, and so is an adversary to the grace of God, which is plainly proved from the prayers of holy men; and (*quicunque negat parvulos per baptismum Christi a perditione liberari, et salutem percipere sempiternam.*) 'whoever denies that infants 'are by Christian baptism delivered from perdition, 'and brought to eternal salvation, let him be ana-'thema.'

"And for the other things that are objected to them, we doubt not but your Reverence will, when you shall have seen the episcopal acts which are said to have passed in the east, judge so as to give occasion to us all to rejoice in the mercy of God."

The Synodical Epistle of the Milevitan Council to Innocent †[316].

They represent to him that there was "a new heresy sprung up of men that were enemies to the grace of Christ, who went about to deprive people of the benefit of the Lord's Prayer," &c.; and after many things said on that subject, they add,

"Also, they do by a wicked presumption contend that little infants shall have an eternal life, though they be not renewed by the sacraments of the Christian grace, mak-

* Five years before. † Apud Augustinum, epist. 92.

ing that of no effect which the apostle says, *By one man sin entered into the world, &c.*

"Therefore, to omit many other things which they discourse against the holy Scriptures, these two things, which do support the hearts of the faithful, and in which they go about to subvert all our Christianity, viz. "That God is not to be prayed to, to be our helper against the evil of sin, and for working righteousness; and that the sacrament of the Christian grace is not helpful to infants for obtaining eternal life: — these when we have signified to your apostolical breast, we have not need to say much," &c.

There was another letter † written to Innocent at the same time, and on the same subject, in a more familiar style, by five bishops, who, I suppose, had some personal acquaintance with him, viz. Aurelius, who had made one at the Council of Carthage; Alipius, St. Austin, and Possidius, who had been in the other Council; and Euodius, whose name is to neither of them. They give him to understand that they hear there are several at Rome, who do favour Pelagius, — some who are brought over to his opinion; others, that will not believe he is of that opinion. That in all probability Pelagius had imposed upon the bishops at Diospolis, who, when they heard him own the *grace of God*, could think no other but that he meant that grace by which we are made good Christians, and not that only by which we are made rational men; whereas he, in his books (which the bishops of Diospolis had not seen) says to God in effect, "Thou hast made us men, but we have made ourselves good men;" — therefore, they advise him to send for Pelagius to Rome, or to deal with him by letters, that if he will explain himself in a Catholic sense, he may be acquitted indeed.

To that purpose St. Austin sends to Innocent a letter that he had written to Pelagius, desiring him to send it to him. "For then (says he) he will the rather vouch-

* Inter Epistolas Augustini, epist. 95.

safe to read it, regarding more him that sent it than him that wrote it."

They sent him withal a book of Pelagius's; I suppose that *de Viribus Naturæ*, spoken of before.

Innocent returned three letters [317] in answer to these three. They are the 91st, 93d, and 96th, that are printed among the letters of St. Austin. He agrees perfectly with them in the points of doctrine, and in the proofs that they had brought for them; and for the case of infants particularly, he says, * That which Pelagius and Celestius do teach, viz. that they may have eternal life without baptism, is (*perfatuum*) 'very absurd.' He says, they would by this means "make their baptism of no use: That if it did them no hurt that they are not regenerated, then the same men must hold that the waters of regeneration do them no good." It seems probable by these words, that this Pope did not understand how Pelagius distinguished between *eternal life* and the *kingdom of Heaven*. In fine, he gives his sentence, 'That they are to be accounted excommunicate till they do repent and recant.'

And to what St. Austin and the other four had desired, that he would send for Pelagius, or write to him, he answers,

† "He ought rather to come himself, that he may be absolved; for if he be still of the same opinion, when will he ever commit himself to our judgment, how many letters soever be sent him, when he knows he must be condemned? — and if he were to be sent for, it might be better done by them that are nearer him, and not separated by so great a space of land; but yet, if he will give any room for medicine, our care shall not be wanting; for he may condemn the opinions he has been of, and send his letters, and ask pardon for his error, as becomes one that returns to us.

"For his book which you sent, I have read it; in which I find a great many blasphemous things," &c.

These letters of Innocent are dated in January 417

* Epist. 93. † Epist. 96.

[317]; and he died the March following; and whether he had before his death wrote to Pelagius, or whether Pelagius had heard of what passed, he did write to Innocent an apologetic letter, and sent withal (*Libellum Fidei*) 'a written account of his faith.' In which he endeavours both to shew his own faith to be blameless, and also to be even with St. Hierom for his dialogues; so that Julian calls it * an answer to them; but Innocent being dead before they came, they were delivered to Zosimus, who had been chosen bishop in his stead. Celestius also came thither himself, and published and gave into the hands of Zosimus his *Libellus*, or *Draught of Faith* likewise.

Some learned men † make Celestius to have published two treatises at Rome at this time, — one called *Confessio Fidei Zosimo Papæ Oblata*; and the other, *Ad Zosimum Papam Libellus*; and that the *Confessio Fidei* was in a manner the same with Pelagius's *Libellus*, in sentences and words; and that Pelagius's *Libellus* is that which goes under the name of St. Hierom's *Explanatio Symboli ad Damasum*; and Celestius's *Confessio Fidei*, is for the greatest part the same with that which goes for St. Austin's *Sermo* 191 *de Tempore*.

But Celestius published but one; which may be called *Confessio Fidei*, or *Libellus Fidei*. St. Austin always calls it by the latter name; and that did considerably differ from Pelagius's *Libellus*, being (as St. Austin observes ‡, and we shall see) "much more frank and open in the denial of original sin."

And whereas they make one to be like the *Explanatio Symboli* in St. Hierom; and the other to be in a manner the same with the *Sermo* 191, in St. Austin's works; these two are not only in a manner the same, but are the very same (being Pelagius's *Libellus* aforesaid) saving a few various lections, and saving that *that* in St. Austin's works has an impertinent Preface affixed to

* Apud Augustin. Operis imperfecti, lib. 4, c. 87.
† F. Garner and Dr. Cave, Hist. Literar. in Pelagio et Celestio.
‡ De Peccato Orig. cap. 2.

the beginning, and a bit cut off from the end by some idle monk, to make it serve for a sermon.

I shall recite it here at large (though a small part of it only do relate to our purpose); and add a few short notes on it; and this I do for two reasons: —

1. For the credit of Pelagius, and of our country. St. Austin always speaks of him as a man of extraordinary capacity and accomplishments; and one whom he should much admire and love, were it not for his heterodox opinions; and the works of his that are left, do shew him a man of very good parts. There are none left entire but this, and a letter of his to Demetrias. Both that letter is as polite and, as Orisius expresses it, elaborate a piece as any that age afforded; and also this confession of his faith is as handsomely and learnedly penned as any of the Creeds drawn up by private men of that time, whereof there were many, save that he does not speak home to the clearing of that point on which he was questioned; and yet, though these are by much the most ancient pieces extant that ever were written by one born in our country, they have never yet been published in our language.

2dly, I do it that I may put our Socinians out of love with him. They do much hug some notions of his, which being first dressed up and represented plausible for their turn in French, they have translated and published in English; but they shall see that, how well soever he please them in some of their lesser errors, yet, as to their main article, he is their mortal enemy, and counts them worthy of an anathema; being as decretory against them as Athanasius, or Austin, or any of the ancient Catholic Christians were, whose names they hate.

His Creed (*a*) is this, sent with a letter to Pope Innocent, but finding him dead, as I said.

(*a*) This Creed, for so ancient a one (for it is much ancienter than that which goes under the name of *Athanasius*, and within thirty-six years of the Constantinopolitan) is very express and particular in reference to the holy Trinity; and St. Austin finds no

"We believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of all things, visible and invisible; we believe also in the Lord Jesus Christ, by whom all things were created; very God, the only begotten, the true Son of God, not a made or adapted One, but begotten; of one substance with the Father, which the Greeks express by ὁμοούσιον; and in such a manner equal in all things with the Father, that he cannot be [accounted] inferior either in time, or degree, or power; and we acknowledge him that is begotten to be of the same greatness as he is that begot him.

---

fault with it as to that matter; he only says * "After he has ended a discourse as long as he pleased, from the unity of the Trinity to the resurrection of the flesh, which no body demanded of him, he says," &c.

It is to be noted, that he had, before he fell into any heresy, written three books concerning the Faith of the Trinity; which Gennadius, in the catalogue he gives † of Pelagius's books, commends as useful ones; and since they are lost, this Creed may serve for an abridgment of them.

And here I will make a remark on the title of another book of his, which Gennadius there mentions, which is lost, except a few fragments; for why should not I, as well as others, take a little pride in the mending the writing of an ancient book? Pelagius gathered together, and published some select places of Scripture, relating to moral duties and the practical part of religion. Gennadius recites the title of this book. It is in the ordinary editions, *Pro actuali Conversatione Eulogiarum ex Divinis Scripturis liber unus, capitulorum indiciis in modum Cypriani Martyris præsignatus. Eulogiarum* there is no sense; so some have put instead of it, the Greek εὐλογιῶν; and others have made other guesses; but I have a very old edition of some of St. Hierom's works, Ven. 1476, in which this passage of Gennadius is recited at two several places; in one it is *Eulogarum*, in the other it is *Æglogarum*; so that I make no doubt but the true writing was *Eclogarum*; and so the title of the book was plainly this, *Collections of the Texts of holy Scripture, concerning a Man's actual Conversation.* This is that book of his to which St. Hierom refers, when he, in the passage even now recited, speaking to Pelagius, says, "The blessed martyr Cyprian, whom you pretend to have imitated, in collecting into order some places of holy Scripture," &c.

The same edition that I mentioned would help to correct several places in the text of St. Hierom himself, which are depraved, and some of them, I doubt, on purpose.

* De Gratia Christi, c. 32. † De Scrip. Eccl. c. 42.

"And whereas we say the Son is *begotten* of the Father, we do not ascribe any time to that divine and ineffable generation; but do mean, that neither the Father nor the Son had any beginning; for we cannot otherwise confess the Father to be eternal, unless we do also confess the Son to be co-eternal; for he is called *the Father*, as having a Son; and he who ever was a Father, ever had a Son.

"We believe also in the (*a*) Holy Spirit, very God, proceeding from the Father, equal in all things with the Father and the Son, in power, in will, in eternity, in substance. Neither is there any degree [*or graduation*] in the Trinity, — nothing that can be called Superior or Inferior, but the whole Deity is equal in its perfection; so that except the words that signify the propriety of the persons, whatsoever is said of one person, may very well be understood of all Three.

"And as in confutation of Arius, we say that the substance of the Trinity is one and the same, and do own one God in three Persons, so avoiding the impiety of Sabellius, we distinguish three Persons expressed by their property, — not saying that the Father is a father to himself, nor the Son a son to himself, nor the Holy Spirit the spirit of himself; but that there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Spirit; for we acknowledge not only [several] names, but also properties of the names, that is, Persons, or, as the Greeks express them, Hypostases; nor does the Father at any time (*b*) exclude the person of the Son, or of the Holy Spirit; nor again does the Son, or Holy Spirit, receive the name or person of the Fa-

---

(*a*) *Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father.*] No Creed at this time had any more. His procession from the Son also, has been since put into the Constantinopolitan by the Latins; so also afterward, he says nothing of Christ's descent into *Hades*, or Hell; which was not as yet put into any Creed of the Catholics, except that of *Aquileia*.

(*b*) *Exclude the person of the Son.*] In all the editions both of St. Hierom's and St. Austin's works, which I could see, it is *excludit*; but I guess it is false printed for *includit*, *induit*, *accipit*, or some such word.

ther; but the Father is always Father, the Son always Son, and the Holy Spirit always Holy Spirit; so that they are in substance one thing, but are distinguished by persons and by names.

'And we say That this Son of God, who, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, inherited eternity without any beginning, did, in the end of the world, take upon him, of Mary, who was always a virgin, perfect man of our nature; and the WORD was made flesh, by taking manhood to him, not by altering his Deity.

"And we do not say that the (*a*) Holy Spirit was instead of seed, as a certain person does most impiously hold [*or as some very impious persons hold*]; but that he operated by the power and influence of the Creator.

"And we do in such a manner hold that there is in Christ one person of the Son, as that we say there are in him two perfect and entire substances [*or natures*] viz. of the Godhead, and of the Manhood, which consists of body and soul.

"And as we do condemn Photinus, who confesses in Christ only a mere man,—so we do anathematize Apollinaris, and all of that sort, who say that the Son of God did take on him any thing less than the whole human nature; and that the man [*or manhood*] which was assumed, was either in body, or in (*b*) soul, or in mind,

---

(*a*) *Holy Spirit instead of Seed.*] I do not remember any sect that held this. Tertullian had, in an allusive way of speaking, said, * "Being the Son of God from the seed, that is, the Spirit of God his Father, flesh without the seed of man was to be taken by him, that he might be the Son of Man; for the seed of any man was not proper for him who had the seed of God;" — and St. Hilary †, in the same way of speaking, had called it *The Seminative Power of the Spirit coming on her*; but Pelagius seems to aim at some person or persons then living. In one of my copies it is *Ut quidam sceleratissimi opinantur;* but in that elder one that I mentioned, it is *Ut quidam sceleratissime opinatur.* I am afraid St. Hierom might have somewhere said some such thing by way of allusion; for Pelagius's chief spite was at him; but I do not remember it.

(*b*) *Or in soul, or in mind.*] The words are *Vel in anima, vel in sensu;* but they must be intended for the translation of ψυχὴ

* De Carne Christi, c. 18. † Lib. 2, de Trinitate.

unlike to those for whose sake it was assumed; whom we do hold to have been like unto us, saving only the stain of (a) sin, which is not natural to us.

"We do also abhor in like manner the blasphemy of those who go about by a new interpretation to maintain, that since the time of his taking flesh, (b) all things

---

and νοῦς; for Apollinaris said, that Christ's human nature had ψυχὴν, but not νοῦν.

(a) *Sin, which is not natural to us.*] He takes some advantage of this for his opinion against original sin; but that which was not natural to man, as God made him, is become, in some sense, natural, since his depravation.

(b) *All things belonging to the divine nature pass into the man, and* è contra.] He is large against this impiety, which was held by the Arians and the Apollinarists. The Arians had this aim in teaching it, that, by owning the divine nature of Christ to have suffered, the Christians might fall into their opinion, that this divine nature was not the same with that of God the Father. Phæbadius had a little before this [259] written a tract against the form of faith drawn up at Sirmium; wherein he mentions * an epistle of Potamius, the Arian, that had disseminated this doctrine, that the divinity of Christ had suffered. "This you do (says he) that people should not believe him born of him who is undoubtedly incapable of suffering;" — and Epiphanius says the same thing of the Arians, Hær. 69.

The Eutychians also ran far into this notion of the communication of properties; but that was a good while after Pelagius's time.

As it is hard for eager spirits to keep the mean, it was but ten years after this [348], that Nestorius made a very ill use of this same notion of the properties of each nature being incommunicable, to establish an impiety in the other extreme, viz. that the λόγος and the man Christ are two Persons. Under pretence of inveighing against one error, he runs into the other; for, speaking of his adversaries, he says, † "They make use of the union of God and man to establish a confused mixture, &c. They speak of God the WORD, who is consubstantial with the Father, as if he had taken the beginning of his origin from the Virgin Mother of Christ; as if he had been built together with his temple, and buried with his flesh. They say that the same flesh did not remain after his resurrection; but did pass into the nature of the Godhead," &c. — But then he adds, "The virgin, whom many have ventured to call the Mother of Christ, they are not afraid to call the Mother of God."

There wanted only the accuracy of speaking, which Pelagius had here used, to clear and settle that dispute between the Nestorians

* Cap. 7. † Ad Cælestinum Papam, Epist. 1.

pertaining to the divine nature did pass into the man [*or manhood*] and so also that all things belonging to the human nature were transferred into God [*or the divine nature*]. From whence would follow (a thing that no heresy ever offered to affirm) that both substances [*or natures*] viz. of the divinity and the humanity, would by this confusion seem to be extinguished, and to lose their proper state, and be changed into another thing; so that they who own in the Son an imperfect God and an imperfect man, are to be accounted not to hold truly either God or man.

"But we do hold that our nature, capable of suffering, was so assumed by the Son of God, as that the divinity did remain incapable of suffering; for the Son of God suffered (not in appearance only, but really) all those things which the Scripture speaks of, *i. e.* hunger, thirst, weariness, pain, death, and the like; but he suffered in that nature which was capable of suffering, *i. e.* not in that nature which did assume, but in that which was assumed; for the Son of God is, in respect of his Godhead, incapable of suffering as the Father; incomprehensible as the Father; invisible as the Father; — and though the proper Person of the Son, that is, the WORD of God, did take on him humanity capable of suffering, yet the Godhead of the WORD, in its own nature, did not suffer any thing by the inhabiting of the humanity, as did not the whole Trinity, which we must of necessity confess to be incapable of suffering. The Son of God, therefore, died, according to the Scriptures, in respect of that which was capable of dying.

"The third day he rose again: he ascended into Heaven: he sits on the right hand of God the Father; the same nature of flesh still remaining in which he was

---

and Eutychians. He grants here that the Son of God was born, suffered, died, &c. *i. e.* the same Person, who is the Son of God; but not in that nature by which he is God, or the Son of God. — However, when that feud broke out, the Pelagian party joined their interest with the Nestorian, as I shewed before.

born, and suffered, in which also he rose again; for the nature of his humanity is not extinguished, but is glorified, being to continue for ever with the divinity.

"Having, therefore, received of the Father the power of all things in Heaven and Earth, he will come to judge the living and the dead, — that he may reward the just, and punish the sinners.

"We do also believe the resurrection of the flesh, in such a manner as to say that we shall be restored again (*a*) in the same truth of our limbs in which we are now; and that we shall for ever remain such as we shall be once made after the resurrection.

"That there is one life for the saints, but rewards different according to their labour; as on the other side the punishments of wicked men shall be according to the measure of their sins.

"Baptisma unum tenemus, quod iisdem sacramenti verbis in infantibus quibus etiam in majoribus asserimus esse celebrandum."

'We hold *one baptism*, which we say ought to be 'administered (*b*) with the same sacramental words to 'infants as it is to elder persons.'

(*a*) *In the same truth of our limbs.*] *In eadem veritate membrorum in qua nunc sumus.* St. Hierom had inveighed against Rufinus and the Origenists for denying this, and saying that it would be an æthereal body, not of such limbs as we now have; and he had reflected upon the Pelagians, as leaning toward them in many things; but Rufinus had renounced any such opinion; and so does Pelagius here.

In the last clause of this article [*for ever remain such*] he reflects not only on Origen, who believed a great many changes in the future state; but on St. Hierom, who had spoke of Hell torments, as if there were hope that they would not be eternal.

(*b*) *With the same sacramental words to infants.*] St. Hierom had said, as I repeated before, that they must either own that infants are baptized for forgiveness of sins, or else make two baptisms. Pelagius was, therefore, forced to say as he does here; and Celestius, in his *Draught of his Faith*, which I shall recite presently, gives this reason why he grants that infants are baptized for forgiveness of sins, "That we may not seem to make two sorts of baptism."

St. Austin quotes this saying of Pelagius, and some others *ver-*

"If after baptism a man do fall, we believe he may be (*a*) recovered by repentance [*or penance*].

"We receive the Old and New Testament in the (*b*) same number of books as the authority of the Holy Catholic Church doth deliver.

"We believe that our souls are given by God, and we hold that (*c*) they are made by him; anathematizing those who say that (*d*) souls are not, as it were, a part of the substance of God. We do also condemn those who say that the (*e*) souls have sinned in a former state, or that they have lived in the celestial regions before they were sent into bodies.

---

*batim**, as out of his *Libellus Fidei*, and makes some animadversions on them; which makes it so plain that it is Pelagius's, that no critic, great or small, has of late years taken it to be St. Austin's own, except the great master of that art, mentioned before.

(*a*) *Restored by repentance.*] This is against the Novatians. In the copy that is in St. Austin's works, it is said *Primo per reconciliationem, deinde per pœnitentiam*, 'first by reconciliation [*or absolution*], and then by repentance [*or penance*].' That insertion looks like a Monk's hand: but the old edition is as I have translated it.

(*b*) *Same number of books.*] Rufinus had then lately published an *Exposition on the Apostles' Creed*, in which he had given a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament, which the Catholics owned in opposition to the Heretics, exactly agreeing with that of the Protestants, and said, "These are those which the fathers have ranked within the Canon, and on which they would have our doctrines of faith to depend; but it is to be known that there are some other books which have been called by the antients not canonical, but ecclesiastical; where he reckons Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, Maccabees, Hermas, and Judicium Petri, which, he says, the ancient Christians would have to be read in the churches; and for other books, they would not have them read in churches at all.

(*c*) *Souls made by God.*] This is aimed against St. Austin, who inclined to the other opinion, that the soul is by propagation; but never positively asserted by either side.

(*d*) *The soul not a part of the substance of God.*] Against the Manichees and Priscillianists.

(*e*) *Souls sinned in a former state.*] He clears himself from the suspicion of Origenism as to that particular; but yet some of his party embraced it, that they might the better account for the baptism of infants without owning original sin.

* De Gratia Christi, c. 32.

"We do also abhor the blasphemy of those who say that any impossible thing is commanded to man by God; or that the (a) commandments of God cannot be performed by any one man, but that by all men taken together they may: or that do condemn first marriages in compliance with Manichæus, or second marriages in compliance with the Montanists.

"Also we do anathematize those who say that the Son of God (b) did tell lies by necessity of the flesh; and

---

(a) *Commands of God not performed by one man, but by all taken together.*] This is the sentence which Mr. Le Clerc cites as if it were St. Austin's, to shew that he contradicts St. Hierom, as I mentioned. And, indeed, it does not only contradict him, but is levelled at him as a blasphemer; for St. Hierom writing * against that opinion of Pelagius, that a man may live without sin, had used a long discourse, to shew that those men that are free from some sort of faults are subject to other sorts; and that no man can have all virtues. Pelagius is here in hopes to make heresy and blasphemy out of that.

Also, the other clause of this paragraph about condemning marriage, is meant against St. Hierom, who, in many of his works, and particularly in those against Jovinian, had so excessively commended virginity, that some of his expressions were reproachful to the state of marriage, especially of second marriages; and he had been forced to write an apology to explain his meaning.

(b) *Did tell lies by necessity of the flesh; and that, because of the human nature which he had assumed, he could not do all things that he would.*] This is a severe animadversion on St. Hierom, who, in the second of the dialogues which he wrote against Pelagius, being eager in shewing the presumption of that tenet of his, that it is possible for a man to avoid all sin if he will, had argued thus: *I cannot*, says Christ, *do any thing of myself*, &c. The Arians here raise a cavil; but the Church answer, that it is spoken in respect of the human nature which he had assumed. You, on the contrary, say "I can be without sin, if I will." He can do nothing of himself, that he may shew the truth of human nature. You can avoid all sin; that you may, even while you are in the body, set yourself forth as a God.

He told his brethren and kindred that he would not go to the feast of tabernacles; and yet it is written afterward, *But when his brethren were gone up, then he also went up to the feast.* He said he would not go, and yet afterwards did what he denied he would do. Porphyry snarls at this, and accuses him of inconstancy and change, not considering that all things that give offence are to be referred to the flesh [*or imputed to the human nature.*]

* Dialogus 1.

that, because of the human nature which he had taken on him, he could not do all things that he would.

St. Hierom does not, however, call this a lie, as Pelagius would represent his words, but an alteration of purpose, incident to human nature.

And at another place in the same dialogue, having quoted that saying of our Saviour, *Father, if it be possible, remove this cup from me*, he adds "Why, I pray you, does he use the words of one that were in doubt?" He had said in another place, *The things that are impossible with men, are possible with God.* But being a man, and to suffer, he speaks in the language of a man: he says, *If it be possible, let one hour pass from me.* You say "It is possible to avoid sin all one's life."

Not only Pelagius was of opinion that these sayings were irreverent, and did impute sin to our Saviour as a man, but Theodorus also, bishop of Mopsuestia, who was a Pelagian likewise, wrote a treatise *Against those that say Men sin by Nature, and not by their Will.* He calls the adversary, whom he there expresses by a feigned name, *Aram*; but he means St. Hierom. Photius gives an abstract of the book *; and therein Theodorus imputes to his adversary this saying, "That even Christ having assumed the human nature, which is infected with sin, was not free from wickedness: but this is to put a very malicious interpretation upon St. Hierom's words, which were, indeed, not very warily spoken.

The writer of the first of those two letters of the Pelagians, against which St. Austin wrote his four books to Pope Boniface, made afterward the same spiteful reflection, saying of his adversaries (*i. e.* the Catholics in general, that they held, among a great many horrid things which he there heaps up) "That Christ was not clear from sin, but that he told lies by the necessity of the flesh, and was stained with other sins." To which St. Austin there † answers "Let them look to it whom he has heard say such things, or in whose books he has read something perhaps which he did not understand, and has turned to this slanderous sense by a deceitful malice." St. Austin speaks so as that one may guess he knew where they had this; but was not willing to enter into a dispute to vindicate St. Hierom's words.

The eighteen Pelagian bishops had this over again in their letter to the bishop of Thessalonica, as we may see by St. Austin's second book to Boniface, c. 6.: and Julian again, as appears by St. Austin's answer to him, lib. 3. c. 6.

St. Hierom, at many other places, owns in plain words that our Saviour had no sin; and therefore this spiteful advantage ought not to be taken of his words in this one place. Even in these very dialogues, *Dial.* 2, having shewed that all that are mere men have some failings, he adds, "To have all things, and to be wanting in

* Bibliot. cod. 177. † Lib. 1. ad Bonifac. c. 12.

"We do also condemn the heresy of Jovinian, who says that in the life to come there will be no difference of merits [*or rewards*]; (*a*) and that we shall there have virtues [*or graces*] which we took no care to have here.

"Free-will we do so own, as to say that (*b*) we always stand in need of God's help; and that as well they are in an error who say with Manichæus that a man

---

nothing, is peculiar to the virtue of him *who did no sin, neither was any guile found in his mouth.*"

St. Hierom had, moreover, in the third of these Dialogues, cited a place in the *Gospel of the Nazarenes*, where Christ is brought in speaking thus: *What sin have I committed that I should go and be baptized of John, unless this that I have spoken be a sin of ignorance?* But he does not pretend there that this book is authentical, or to be credited; and yet the Pelagians afterward objected thus to him, as if he had by this quotation gone about to establish a fifth Gospel, which taught that Christ did sin.

(*a*) *And that we shall there have virtues which we took no care to have here.*] St. Hierom had not said so, but he had said something which Pelagius would draw to that sense. He had said * "So long as we have this treasure in earthen vessels, and are encompassed with frail, and mortal, and contemptible flesh, we think ourselves happy if in some single virtues, or parts of virtue, we do service to God. But when this corruptible shall be clothed on with incorruption, and Death shall be swallowed up in the victory of Christ, then God will be all things in all men: so that Solomon will have not only the grace of wisdom, David of meekness, &c. and each two or three virtues, but all will be in each, and the whole number of saints shall triumph in the whole chorus of virtues." Though these words give no sufficient ground for this calumny, yet the Pelagians ceased not to inculcate their accusation of the doctrine of the Catholics upon occasion taken from them. Julian and the seventeen bishops harped upon the same string; for we find St. Austin answering them thus: † "Who can bear it when they object to us, as if we did say that after the resurrection there will be such a proficiency, that *men shall there begin to keep those commands of God, which they refused to keep here;* and all this because we say that there will be there no sin at all, nor any conflict with the concupiscence of sin? as if they themselves did dare to deny this.

(*b*) *We do always stand in need of God's help.*] St. Austin quotes this sentence ‡, and then says "Here again we would know what sort of help he owns us to stand in need of, and again we find him ambiguous; for he may say that he means the law and Christian doctrine, by which our natural power is helped," &c.

* Dial. 1. † Lib. 3. ad Bonifac. c. 7. ‡ De Gratia Christi, c. 33.

cannot avoid sin, as they who affirm with Jovinian that a man cannot sin; for both of these take away the freedom of the will. But we say that a man always is in a state that he may sin, or may not sin, so as to own ourselves always to be of a free-will.

"This is, most blessed Pope, our faith which we have learned in the Catholic Church, and have always held; in which, if there be any thing that is, perhaps, unwarily or unskilfully expected, we desire it may be amended by you, who do hold both the faith and the see of Peter. And if our confession be approved by the judgment of your apostleship, then whoever shall have a mind to find fault with me will shew, not me to be a heretic, but himself unskilful or spiteful, or even no Catholic."

Together with this confession of his faith, Pelagius sent a letter to Innocent, apologizing for himself, and endeavouring to shew that he did not in all points hold, as his adversaries gave out; and to justify what he did hold. He was very desirous to continue in the Catholic Church, and not be separated from it. He used great art in reciting the articles objected against him, so as that he could easily answer them or deny them; and in wording his own opinion so as he could easily defend them. The letter is lost, except such parts of it as St. Austin has preserved by quoting them, as he had occasion to write animadversions on them. I shall recite only that passage of St. Austin, where he quotes that part of the letter which speaks of the baptism of infants, which is this: —

Augustin. de Peccato Originali, c. 17, 18, *&c.*

Observe how Pelagius attempted slily to deceive even the episcopal judgment of the apostolic see in this very question of the baptism of infants: for in the letter which he sent to Rome to holy Pope Innocent, of blessed memory, which finding him not in the body, was delivered to holy Pope Zosimus, and by him transmitted to us; he says, —

"Se ab hominibus infamari quod neget parvulis bap-

tismi sacramentum, et absque redemptione Christi aliquibus regna cœlorum promittat."

'That men do slander him as if he denied the sacrament of baptism to infants, and did promise the kingdom of Heaven to any persons without the redemption of Christ.'

But these things are not so objected to them as he has set them down; for they do not deny the sacrament of baptism to infants, neither do they promise the kingdom of Heaven to any without the redemption of Christ: so that the thing he complains he is slandered in, he has set down so as that he might easily answer to the crime objected, and yet keep his opinion. But the thing that is objected to them is this, that they will not own that unbaptized infants are liable to the condemnation of the first man, and that there has passed upon them original sin, which is to be cleansed by regeneration; but do contend that they are to be baptized only for their receiving the kingdom of Heaven, &c. And then mark how he answers, and mind his lurking holes of ambiguity, &c.; for, having said

"Nunquam se vel impium aliquem hæreticum audisse, qui hoc quod proposuit de pavulis, diceret:"
'That he never heard, no, not even any impious heretic or sectary, who would say that (which he had mentioned) of infants,'

He then goes on, and says,

"Quis enim ita evangelicæ lectionis ignarus est, qui hoc non modo affirmare conetur, sed qui vel leviter dicere aut etiam sentire possit? Denique quis tam impius, qui parvulos exortes regni cœlorum esse velit, dum eos baptizari et in Christo renasci vetat?"

'For who is there so ignorant of that which is read in the Gospel, as (I need not say to affirm this, but) in any heedless way to say such a thing, or even to have such a thought? In a word, Who can be so impious as to hinder infants from being baptized and born again

'in Christ, and so make them miss of the kingdom of 'Heaven?'

All this talk is nothing to his purpose; he does not clear himself by this: that infants without baptism cannot enter into the kingdom of Heaven, is a thing which they themselves never denied. But that is not the question; the question is about the cleansing of original sin in infants: let him clear himself on that point; he will not own that the laver of regeneration has any thing which it need wash off in infants. And let us see what he says next: after reciting that testimony of the Gospel, that "Nisi renatus ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, regnum cœlorum nullus possit intrare."

'None can enter into the kingdom of Heaven that is 'not born again of water and the Holy Spirit.'

About which there is, as I said, no question; he goes on and says "Quis ille tam impius est, qui cujuslibet ætatis parvulo interdicat communem humani generis redemptionem?"

'Who is there so impious as to refuse to an infant, of 'what age soever, the common redemption of mankind?'

This, too, is ambiguous, what redemption he means: whether from a bad estate to a good one, or from a good one to a better; for Celestius did own in his book at Carthage the redemption of infants; and yet would not own that sin did pass from Adam on them. But mind his next words — "Et in perpetuam certamque vitam renasci vetet eum qui natus est ad incertam?"

'And to hinder him that is born to an uncertain life 'from being born again to an everlasting and certain 'one?'

St. Austin is something long in conjecturing what he means by these last words; but he pitches on this: That as Pelagius would not own children to be by nature in a state of condemnation, and on the other side granted that they were not born in a state to go to Heaven, — so

he would not determine so positively as some of his abettors did, that they should have an eternal life out of the kingdom of Heaven, but left it as an uncertain thing what should become of them; and therefore said that they were born to an uncertain life; but that if they were baptized they would have an everlasting life, and that certainly in Heaven: and he quotes on this occasion that saying of his, which I mentioned before, "For unbaptized infants I know whither they do not go; but whither they do go I know not." And this phrase of his, *Vitam incertam*, is much the same with that which I recited of St. Ambrose: * *Opertam illam pœnarum immunitatem*; 'That state of freedom from punishment, 'which is not clear.'

The chief thing I observe in this letter is the Confession of Pelagius, that he had never heard, no not even any sectary, deny the sacrament of baptism to infants. For the words of the letter, if we put together the paragraphs which stand disjoined in this animadversion of St. Austin on them were thus:—

"Men slander me as if I denied the sacrament of baptism to infants, or did promise the kingdom of Heaven to some persons without the redemption of Christ; which is a thing that I never heard, no not even any wicked heretic say. For who is there so ignorant of that which is read in the Gospel, as (I need not say to affirm this, but) in any heedless way to say such a thing, or even have such a thought? In a word, Who can be so impious as to hinder infants from being baptized and born again in Christ, and so make them miss of the kingdom of Heaven, since our Saviour has said that none can enter into the kingdom of Heaven that is not born again of water and the Holy Spirit? Who is there so impious as to refuse to an infant, of what age soever, the common redemption of mankind, and to hinder him that is born to an uncertain life, from being born again to an everlasting and certain one?"

The Creed, or Book of Faith, which Cælestius pre-

* Chap. xiii.

sented, is nowhere extant. St. Austin has recited some parts of it, which shew plain enough that it differed from that of Pelagius. I will mention one passage which he recites *, which is to our purpose.

"Infantes autem debere baptizari in remissionem peccatorum secundum regulam universalis ecclesiæ, et secundum evangelii sententiam confitemur; quia Dominus statuit regnum cœlorum non nisi baptizatis posse conferri: quod quia vires naturæ non habent, conferre necesse est per gratiæ libertatem. In remissionem autem peccatorum baptizandos infantes non idcirco diximus, ut peccatum ex traduce firmare videamur; quod longe a Catholico sensu alienum est. Quia peccatum non cum homine nascitur, quod postmodum exercetur ab homine: Quia non naturæ delictum, sed voluntatis esse demonstratur. Et illud ergo confiteri congruum; ne diversa baptismatis genera facere videamur; et hoc præmunire necessarium est, ne per mysterii occasionem, ad Creatoris injuriam, malum antequam fiat ab homine tradi dicatur homini per naturam."

'We own that infants ought, according to the rule 'of the Universal Church, and according to the sentence 'of the gospel, to be baptized for forgiveness of sins, 'because our Lord has determined that the kingdom of 'Heaven cannot be conferred upon any but baptized 'persons; which, because it is a thing that Nature can-'not give, it is needful to give it by the liberty of grace. 'But when we say that infants are to be baptized for 'forgiveness of sins, we do not say it with such intent 'as that we would seem to confirm the opinion of sin 'being by derivation [*or propagation*] which is a thing 'far from the Catholic sense; for sin is not born with 'a man which is afterward acted by man; because it is 'demonstrable that sin is a thing not of nature but of 'choice: therefore it is both proper to own the former, 'that we may not seem to make two sorts of baptism;

* De Peccato Originali, c. 5.

'and also necessary to give a caution about the latter, 'lest on occasion of the sacrament it be, to the re-'proach of the Creator, said, that evil is by nature con-'veyed to a man before it be acted by him.'

Pelagius expressed himself more slily in his Creed: he said that infants are to be baptized with the same words as elder persons are. St. Austin excepts against that and says *, "It is things that we regard, and not words only:" but, beside, Pelagius did not nigh so plainly or openly in his Creed to Innocent deny original sin, though he had in other books.

But at last Pelagius [319] swallowed this morsel too: for Pinianus, Albina, and Melania do certify St. Austin, that upon their importunity used with Pelagius to renounce the opinions for which he was censured, he had in their hearing said, *Infantes in remissionem peccatorum percipere baptismum:* 'That infants do receive 'baptism for remission of sins.' St. Austin answers †, "That *that* is indeed more than he had said in his *Libellus*; for now he does not say with the words of forgiveness, but confesses that they are baptized for forgiveness itself; and yet if you should ask him what sin he thinks is forgiven them, he would maintain that they had none at all. Who could think that under so plain a confession a contrary sense could lie hid, if Celestius had not bolted it out?" &c.

They that would maintain a dispute or theological wrestle, and would not take this for a fair fall or baffle, it could be no longer worth the while to contend with them. Pelagius had *had* at the council of Diospolis some silly sayings objected to him out of a book; and when he denied the book to be his, they asked him Whether, since he disowned those sayings, he would anathematize those that said such things? He answered, "I anathematize them for fools, not for heretics, for there is no article of faith spoken of in them." But now he himself, when he is driven to this plunge as to grant

* De Gratia Christi, c. 32. † Ibid.

that infants are baptized for pardon of sins, and yet have no sin, shews himself as absurd as they could be.

The way by which his partners went about to make sense of this odd saying, we have in a letter of St. Austin to Sixtus*, written a good while after these times. There St. Austin having said of the Pelagians, That they are so *circumstipati et divinarum autoritate lectionum, et antiquitus tradito et retento firmo ecclesiæ ritu in baptismate parvulorum :* 'beset both with the authority of God's word, and with the usage of the church 'that was of old delivered to it, and has been since 'kept by it, in the baptizing of children,' that they dare not deny that infants are baptized for *forgiveness of sin*; and that it must not be supposed that the church does this (*fallaciter*) "in any trickish or deceitful meaning;" but, *ut fide agatur quod agitur, utique fit quod dicitur :* 'since what is acted, is acted seriously, that 'which is spoken must be supposed to be really done.' He adds,

"That, therefore, which they have devised to say, when this manifest force of truth weighed them down, what Christian is there that will not laugh to hear, tho' he must own it to be very crafty? For they say that 'infants do indeed answer truly by the mouths of those that bring them, that they believe in the forgiveness of sins, — not that any sins are forgiven to them; but that they believe that in the church, or in baptism, sins are forgiven to those that have any, not to those that have none;' and so they do not yield that infants are baptized for forgiveness of sins in such a sense as that any sins are forgiven to them, who, they say, have none; but that they, though they be without sin, yet are baptized with that baptism by which is granted forgiveness of sins to all that have any."

There will ever be this difference between a man of sense and a thick skulled man; that the former, if he find himself gravelled, will at least have the modesty to give

* Epist. 105.

over talking. Pelagius, after he was brought to this contradiction, kept silence, and we hear no more of him; — but Celestius blundered through all this, and a great deal more, — when he was excommunicated at one place, going to another; and he, after all this, continued to make such a noise in the eastern parts, that the heresy which was called *Pelagian* in the west, was there called *The Celestine Heresy*. After several excommunications in *particular* churches, he was at last pronounced a Heretic in the General Council or meeting of all the eastern and western bishops at Ephesus [331].

F. Garner reckons up twenty-four synods, in several parts of the world, held against this error; whereof this of Ephesus was the last; and the twenty-second was at St. Alban's, in Britain (the year of Christ 429 [329], as Bishop Usher, and Garner out of him, do shew); so that if Pelagius lived to this time, he lived to see himself condemned by his own countrymen.

I shall take notice only of two more artifices that these men used to stave off excommunication, and so dismiss them.

1. They spoke with words of seeming submission to the bishops to whom they appealed. You see with what a compliment Pelagius concludes the *Confession of his Faith* to Pope Innocent; and Celestius began his to Zosimus with one of the like nature; for in the Preface of it there were these words: * "That if any mistake have by chance happened to me through ignorance, as being a man, it may by your skill be corrected;" and when Zosimus asked him if he would † "renounce all those tenets which had been objected to him formerly by the deacon Paulinus, and would give his assent to the letters of the Apostolic See, which had been written by his predecessor of holy memory, — he refused to renounce the articles objected by the deacon; but he did not dare to oppose the letters of holy Pope

* Aug. de Peccato Orig. c. 6. † Ibid. cap. 7.

Innocent. Nay, he promised to renounce all things which that See did renounce." This St. Austin repeats from the acts of his examination.

But what do these general words avail, when he, reciting the particulars of his faith, did, as we see, plainly renounce the doctrine of original sin, in an absolute contrariety to the letters of Innocent, to which he pretended to submit.

Yet as all men have a weak side on which they receive flatterers, this verbal compliance took so far with Zosimus, that he undertook the patronage of these men against the African bishops, and wrote several letters in their behalf [318]; and continued so long to hold on their side, till at last he found it too hot to hold any longer; and then when he saw they were condemned by the Council of Carthage, and by the emperor, and would be condemned by the Christian world, whether he would or no, he himself wrote an *Encyclical Epistle*, as zealous in their condemnation as he had been before in their defence; a part of which I shall presently recite.

This made Julian and the other following Pelagians say, * "That Pope Zosimus and the rest of the clergy of Rome, were turncoats." Indeed, he acted so as to make it plainly appear, that the infallibility of that See is a gift that has been bestowed upon them since that time [317]; for, mind the particulars:

1. Pope Innocent had by his letters, dated in January 417, which I mentioned before, fully and plainly condemned the doctrine that denies original sin; and had condemned Pelagius and Celestius, unless they did recant.

2. Pope Zosimus, some time in the summer of the same year [317], upon Celestius's application to him, "sat on a day of hearing in St. Clement's church, &c.; and caused Celestius's *Libellus*, which he had given in" [this is the same *Libellus Fidei*, or Creed, of which I

* August. ad Bonifac. lib. 2, c. 3.

just now cited a part, denying original sin] "to be read over;" and he writes a letter to the African Bishops, that he had done so (which is his third epistle extant, tom. 1, *Consiliorum*) wherein he blames them as having been too hasty in censuring Pelagius and Celestius, and sends a copy of Celestius's *Libellus* to them, and orders thus: — "Either within two months let somebody come that may convict him to his face, of holding other opinions than he has set down in his books and Confession, or else, after such plain and manifest declarations made by him, let your Holiness know that there is no doubt remaining, viz. but that he is to be acquitted."

3. A little while after, viz. September 21st, he writes another letter to them, * that he now had received Pelagius's letter and *Libellus* likewise; and a letter from Praylus, bishop of Jerusalem, in his behalf." That these had been publicly read over; and that the contents of them were all to the same purpose, sense, and tenor with what Celestius had produced before. Oh, brethren, that any of you had been present at the reading of them! What joy there was of the holy men that were present! Some could scarce forbear weeping (*tales etiam* [*l. tam*] *absolutæ fidei infamari potuisse*) 'that it should be possible for such men, of so unrebukable a faith, to be slandered.' Then he inveighs against their accusers, and at last says, "If the father rejoiced at the return of his son that had been dead, and was alive again; had been lost and was found, &c. how much greater rejoicing of our faith is this, that these men, of whom false stories were reported, never were dead nor lost! I have sent, therefore, to your charity, copies of the writings which Pelagius sent," &c.

4. Zosimus declared [317] that *Libellus* of Celestius (in which he says, as I rehearsed before, that "the opinion of sin being *ex traduce*, by derivation or propagation, is far from the Catholic sense) to be Catholic or orthodox. This will appear by the next quotation.

* Zosimi Epist. quarta, tom. 1, Conciliorum.

5. The African bishops wrote † an answer to Zosimus the latter end of this year [317]; wherein they plead, "That Celestius ought to clear himself at another rate than that of saying in general that he would assent to the letters of Pope Innocent: that he ought to be compelled to recite and condemn those ill things which he had put in his *Libellus*; lest, if he did not do that, a great many persons of weak judgments, might be more ready to think that those doctrines, poisonous to our faith, which were in his *Libellus*, were approved by the Apostolic See, because that See had said that *that Libellus* was Catholic, than they would be to think them corrected by it, because he said he would assent to Pope Innocent's letter;" and the next year the same bishops, in a fuller meeting, send him another letter to the same purpose, but more peremptory; wherein, without any more staying for his consent, or joining with them, they determine that Pelagius and Celestius are to be accounted excommunicate till they do recant, &c.

6. Then at last when the emperor also had declared to the same purpose [318], Zosimus himself likewise condemned these men, and the opinions they held against original sin, as well as the rest of the world did, and his own predecessor had done; and sent, as I said, an encyclical or circular letter about to the churches, declaring his excommunication of them. A part of it is recited by St. Austin, in these words:* "Our Lord is faithful in his words, and his baptism has the same plenitude [*or force*] in deed that it has in words: I mean, in its operation, in the owning the true forgiveness of sins, in all sexes, ages, and conditions of mankind; for none is made free, but who was a servant of Sin; nor can any be said to be redeemed, but who was before truly a captive by sin, as it is written, *If the Son do make you free, you shall be free indeed;* for by him we are spiritually regenerated, by him we are crucified to the world; by his death, that bond, contracted

† August. ad Bonifac. lib. 2, cap. 3, 4.
* Epist. 157, ad Optatum.

by propagation of death, brought upon us all by Adam, and transmitted to every soul, is cancelled; and there is not any one of all that are born, but what is bound and liable to that bond, until he be by baptism freed from it." Here he sings the same tune with his predecessors, thanks to the African bishops.

And the Church of Rome from that time has been very zealous in the same doctrine, till now in this last age they are grown great latitudinarians in this matter. The Jesuits have of late set themselves strongly to overthrow St. Austin's doctrine of Prædestination; and, not content with that, have pushed their arguments so far as to undermine the doctrine of original sin; and the Court of Rome shews so much favour to their endeavours, it is probable they would (if they could avoid the slur that would thereby be brought on their infallibility) once more declare for Pelagius.

It seems that a book of Cardinal Sfondrata, which denies the propagation of original sin, and any punishment of unbaptized infants, finds so much favour, that though several French bishops demanded judgment of the Pope against it, they could obtain none. On the contrary, Innocent the Twelfth recommended the printing of it; and there was lately printed an Address to the Assembly of French bishops, *anno* 1700, that they would censure it; but without any success that I have heard of: the title whereof is *Augustiniana Ecclesiæ Romanæ Doctrina, &c.* The book I have not seen, but an abstract of it in the common prints from Holland. It shews, it seems, that such a book as the aforesaid, gives occasion to the heretics to say, That Rome is turning Pelagian.

Zosimus might have been fallible in the case of Pelagius himself, and might have been excused, because he, in a great measure, concealed his opinion in his letter and *Libellus*; so the mistake might be only in matter of fact: but Celestius's *Libellus* spoke open enough, and yet he declared it Catholic, and that not as a private man; but sitting in judicature on a day of hearing in St. Clement's

church; and F. Garner grants, and even proves *, by good reasons, that this was done in a Synod.

St. Austin endeavours to throw a cloke over the nakedness of this Pope; for when the Pelagians afterward claimed him as theirs; and said he must be so, or else he must be owned to have declared contrary to himself, and urged the letters aforesaid, St. Austin pleads †,

1. That Zosimus did not in any of his letters deny original sin. True, but he declared that *Libellus* of Celestius to be Catholic, which did openly deny it to his face.

2. ‡ That Zosimus urged Celestius to assent to the letters of Pope Innocent; which letters maintained the true doctrine. This indeed shews that Zosimus did not perceive a plain contradiction when it came in his way.

3. He takes a charitable advantage of those words in the Preface of Celestius, "That if any mistake have happened to me, &c. it may by your skill be corrected;" and says, § "Whereas Celestius put this [*denial of original sin*] into his *Libellus*, only among those things of which he owned himself as yet to doubt and to desire to be instructed; it was the desire of instruction (in a man of good wit, who, if he had been reformed, might have done a great deal of good) that was approved; and not his false doctrine; and in that sense his *Libellus* was pronounced Catholic; because this is the part of a Catholic mind, if it has any opinions contrary to the truth, not to define them positively, but to renounce them when they appear to be such."

We must commend St. Austin's charity, both to Zosimus and Celestius; but, as Vossius and Bishop Usher observe, he that reads Zosimus's Letters will see that, for a long time, he defended Celestius, — not as one that was in an error, and was willing to be taught better; but as one that was in no error, but had approved himself to have *absolutam fidem* (as he in his

* Dissert. de Synodis in causa Pelagiana.
† Ad Bonifac. lib. 2, c. 3. ‡ Ibid. c. 4. § Cap. 3.

third and fourth epistle calls it) 'a faith absolved from all blame;' — so that, however favourable an account St. Austin gives of this matter, Facundus relates it thus: — * "Zosimus, contrary to the sentence of Innocent, his predecessor, commended the faith of Pelagius and of his partner Celestius, and blamed the bishops of Africa for counting him a heretic."

One thing indeed St. Austin there says, which is a good answer to the Pelagians, who accused the Church of Rome of changing sides and prevaricating in their doctrine when Zosimus turned against them, viz. that if Zosimus did ever declare for them and their doctrine, that rather ought to be accounted the prevarication; — "for † (says he) when in Reverend Innocent's Letters, which say that infants, if they be not baptized in Christ, will remain in eternal death, the ancient Catholic faith is set forth; he certainly ought to be accounted the turn-coat of the Roman Church, that should have deviated from that sentence; which, by God's mercy, was not done.

Another thing that Pelagius and Celestius pleaded was, That supposing they were mistaken in their opinion that there is no original sin, yet, this ought not to be accounted heresy, nor to deserve excommunication. It was no article of our faith to hold one way or the other; it was but one of the questions of lesser moment.

"For Celestius," says St. Austin ‡, "spoke in the ecclesiastical acts at Carthage after this manner: — 'I told you before concerning the derivation of sin, that I have heard several in the Catholic Church deny it; and some I have heard affirm it. It is a matter of controversy, not of heresy. As for infants, I always said that they stand in need of baptism; and that they are to be baptized. What would he have more?' He spoke this with an intent to signify, that if he had denied that infants ought to be baptized, then indeed it might have

* Lib. 7, c. 3, 440. † Ad Bonifac. lib. 2, c. 4.
‡ Ibid. c. 22, 23, 24.

been judged heresy; but now that he confesses that they are to be baptized, though he give not the true reason of their baptism; yet he supposes he does not err in a matter of faith, and, therefore, is not to be accounted a heretic."

"Also in the *Libellus* which he gave in at Rome, when he had spoke as much as he pleased in declaring his faith from the Trinity of one Deity down to the resurrection of the dead, concerning which matters no body ever demanded or objected any thing to him; when he comes to the matter in hand, he says, 'And if any questions have arisen which many people dispute about, I have not determined any thing by a definitive authority, as if I would be the author of any *dogma* [or article of faith]; but I offer those things which I have collected from the fountain of the prophets and apostles, to be tried by the judgment of your apostleship,' &c. You see his purpose of this prefacing is, That if he be found in a mistake, he may seem not to mistake in the faith, but in some questions that are beside the faith, &c.; but he is much out of the way in thinking so. These questions, which he thinks to be beside the faith, are of a very different nature from those in which one may be ignorant, or mistake without hurt to the faith; as, for example, if a question be put, *Where the garden of Paradise is?* &c.; but in the concerns of those two men, by the first of whom we are sold under sin, and by the other redeemed from sin, &c. the Christian faith does properly consist."

And afterward: * "Therefore, whosever does maintain that human nature, in any age whatever, does not stand in need of the second Adam for a physician, as not being defiled in the first Adam, this man's mistake is not in a question in which one may doubt to err without hurt to the faith, but he is convicted as an enemy of God's grace by the very rule of faith, by which we are Christians.

* Ad Bonifac. lib. 2, c. 29.

The most material thing to our purpose to be observed from these passages of the latter part of this history, is this, How exceedingly the Pelagians were pressed with this argument taken from the baptism of infants; and to how many absurdities they were driven in answering of it. Sometimes they said they were not baptized for forgiveness, but for something else; — sometimes they owned they were baptized for forgiveness, not that they had any sin, but that the uniformity of the words might be kept, or because they were baptized into the church, where forgiveness was to be had for those that wanted it, or because they were baptized with a sacrament which had the means of forgiveness for any that had sinned, or should sin; and some flew to that *that* infants have sin, though not by propagation from a sinful stock; but either before they were born, in a former state, or since they were born, by peevishness, &c. Since these men resolved not to own original sin in infants, how much had it been for their turn to deny that they were to be baptized at all! If they had known of any church or society of Christians then in being, or that ever had been, that had disowned infant baptism, their interest would have led them to allege their example, or to plead it in their own behalf; but far from that, Celestius does own that infants are to be baptized according to the rule of the Universal Church; and Pelagius moreover confesses (the same thing in effect that St. Austin in another place urges) that "he never had heard, no, not even any impious heretic or sectary, that denied infants baptism; and that he thought there could not be any one so ignorant as to imagine that infants could enter the kingdom of Heaven without it." You have their words before.

If there had been any such church of Antipædobaptists in the world, these two men could not have missed an opportunity of hearing of them, being so great travellers as they were, for they were born and bred, the one here in Britain, the other in Ireland. They lived the prime of their age (*diutissime*) a very long time, as St. Austin

testifies, at Rome *, — a place to which all the people of the world had then a resort. They were both for some time at Carthage, in Africa; then the one settled at Jerusalem, and the other travelled through all the noted Greek and Eastern Churches in Europe and Asia. It is impossible there should have been any church that had any singular practice in this matter but they must have heard of them; so that one may fairly conclude that there was not at this time, nor in the memory of the men of this time, any Christian society that denied baptism to infants. This cuts off at once all the pretences which some Antipædobaptists would raise from certain probabilities, that the Novations, or Donatists, or the British Church of those times, or any other whom Pelagius must needs know, did deny it. I shall, however, more particularly consider those probabilities at another place †.

Besides the passages I have here recited of this controversy, St. Austin wrote a great many more, which I must omit, because the reciting of them all would make a large volume of itself. Several whole books, and many long epistles, he wrote to several men against the doctrine of Pelagius, where he always makes use of the argument taken from the constant use of the church in baptizing infants, to prove it to be the general sense that they have original sin.

I will only give the names of some of them, that they that have a mind to read more of this matter, may have recourse to them, if they please: —

Augustini ad Valerium de Nuptiis et Concupiscentia. Two books.

Ad Bonifacium contra duas Epistolas Pelagianorum. Four books.

Enchiridion. One book.

De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio. One book.

De Correptione et Gratia. One book.

De Prædestinatione Sanctorum. One book.

* De Peccato Originali, c. 21. † Part 2, ch. 4.

De Dono Perseverantiæ. One book.

Contra Julianum Pelagianum. Six books complete, and other six left imperfect.

De Gestis Palæstinis. One book.

De Octo Dulcitii Quæstionibus. One book.

Comment. in Psalm li, *I was shapen in iniquity*, &c.

Sermo 10, *item* 14 *de Verbis Apostoli, item in Sancti Johannis Nativitatem.*

Letters to Paulinus, to Optatus, to Sextus, to Celestinus, to Vitalis, to Valentinus, and several others.

All these I pass over, saving that, as I have already here and there fetched in some passages of them, I shall, at the end of this chapter recite two or three that will shew how the state of this controversy stood between St. Austin and Julian some years after Pelagius had been condemned and given over disputing.

But first, I must give an account of a Canon of the Council of Carthage, held *anno* 418 [318], about this matter; which is one of the eight that have formerly, by a vulgar error, been attributed to the Council of Milevis, held *anno* 416; whereas the Council of Milevis did only write their sentence in a synodical letter to Innocent; which letter, together with that of the Council of Carthage of the same year, I recited before*. That was in the year 416; and the next year, 417, there was another meeting of the bishops at Carthage, of which nothing is extant, save that it appears by some passages of St. Austin, recited before, and some others, that they declared that they could not acquiesce in that judgment which Pope Zosimus had passed in favour of Celestius, of which they advertised Zosimus by their letter.

But the next year after, viz. 418, there was a full assembly at Carthage of the bishops of all the provinces of Africa, 214 in number. Then it was that they sent that *peremptory* letter to Zosimus, which I spake of; and then also they passed eight canons against the Pelagian tenets.

---

* Chap. 6.

In the second they mention the baptism of infants, condemning two errors about it: — one of those who thought that an infant must upon no account be baptized before he be eight days old. I shewed before (ch. 6) that one Fidus, a bishop near Carthage, had held so 150 years before; and it seems some people were still of that opinion. The other of those that held that absurd opinion (which Pelagius and Celestius had made their last refuge) that infants are baptized for forgiveness of sins, and yet have no sin. The canon is this: —

" *Concilii Carthag. anno* 418, *Canon Secundus.*

" Item placuit ut quicunque parvulos recentes ab uteris matrum baptizandos negat, aut dicit in remissionem quidem peccatorum eos baptizari, sed nihil ex Adam trahere originalis peccati quod lavacro regenerationis expietur (unde sit consequens ut in eis forma baptismatis in remissionem peccatorum non vera sed falsa intelligatur) anathema sit. Quoniam non aliter intelligendum est, quod ait apostolus, *Per unum hominem peccatum intravit in mundum, et per peccatum mors, et ita in omnes homines pertransiit, in quo omnes peccaverunt:* Nisi quemadmodum ecclesia Catholica ubique diffusa semper intellexit. Propter hanc enim regulam fidei, etiam parvuli qui nihil peccatorum in seipsis adhuc committere potuerunt, ideo in peccatorum remissionem veraciter baptizantur, ut in eis regeneratione mundetur quod generatione traxerant."

' Also we determine, That whosoever does deny that ' infants may be baptized when they come fresh from ' their mother's womb, or does say that they are in- ' deed baptized for forgiveness of sins, and yet that ' they derive no original sin from Adam (from whence ' it would follow that the form of baptism for forgive- ' ness of sins is in them not true, but false) let him be ' anathema; for that saying of the apostle, *By one* ' *man sin entered into the world, and death by sin;* ' *and so death passed upon all men, for that* [or in

'whom] *all have sinned*, is to be understood in no other 'sense than as the Catholic Church spread over all 'the world has always understood it; for by this rule 'of faith, even infants, who have not yet been capable 'of committing any sin, in their own persons, are in 'a true sense baptized for forgiveness of sins, that in 'them what was derived by generation may be cleansed 'by regeneration.'

Here this canon ends in most copies; but in some there is a farther clause against such as allow an eternal life in happiness to unbaptized infants, though not in the kingdom of Heaven. I shall have occasion to recite that clause, and my opinion about it, in the next chapter.

The reader will, without any admonition, perceive the mistake of those men, who speak of this canon as if infant baptism were established by it as a thing that had been questioned, or was then newly brought into use. It appears with plainness more than enough, that, as well the makers of this canon, as they against whom it was made, did both of them look on the thing itself as undoubted: they differed about some of the reasons or effects of it only.

But Grotius did very unkindly give an occasion to vulgar ignorant people to run into this mistake, by that saying of his, recited in chap. 6, "That there is in the councils no earlier mention of infant baptism than in the Council of Carthage; meaning this, or that two years before; whereas he himself might know well enough, that, beside the other passages in authors, and beside the Councils I mentioned in chap. 16, it is mentioned in one of the first Councils of which we have any good account since the apostles' time, as I shewed in the aforesaid sixth chapter.

Pelagius and Celestius being thus condemned, and the bishops that would not subscribe to their condemnation being deprived, which were eighteen in number in all the western empire, they made remonstrances, and sent about the east to several places, but found no coun-

tenance; yet Julian, who had been bishop of Eclanum, in Italy, and was the best penman among them, maintained the dispute with St. Austin for some years [330], each of them writing twelve books, one against the other; and St. Austin died while he was writing the last six.

If they had said any thing new, in reference to our subject, it had been necessary to relate it; but there being nothing new, I shall only recite two or three passages, to shew that they spoke about infant baptism in the same tenor as before.

After the condemnation, one of the Pelagian party sent a letter to some of the clergy at Rome, hoping to retrieve an interest there. St. Austin thought it was written by Julian, and answered it as his; but Julian disowned it; and St. Austin was content they should ascribe it to which of their sect they pleased. In it they say many things to clear themselves; and, among the rest, this, which is recited by St. Austin [320], * "We do acknowledge that the grace of Christ is necessary for all, both grown persons and infants; and we renounce all that should say that one that is born of parents both baptized, ought not to be baptized;" — and so in the letter which all the eighteen of them subscribed and sent to the east, "We own baptism to be necessary for all ages †."

To which St. Austin answers ‡ "What does it signify that they do own baptism to be necessary for all ages (which the Manichees hold is needless for any age) so long as they suppose it has no effect in infants for the forgiveness of sin?"

And speaking to Julian himself, § "As to the question of baptism, about which you complain that there is a great odium raised against you among some ignorant people by our lies, it is strange how neatly you come off. You clear yourself of this odium, by owning that

* Lib. 1, ad Bonifac. c. 22.
† Apud August. lib. 2, ad Bonifac. c. 25.
‡ Lib. 4, ad Bonifac. c. 4. § Lib. 3, advers. Julian. c. 3.

[321] 'infants are to be baptized; because, you say, the grace of baptism is not to be altered for the causes [*or subjects*] of it, since it dispenses its gifts according to the capacity of those who come to it; and so Christ, who is the Redeemer of his own workmanship, does by a continued bounty increase his benefits toward his image; and those whom he had made *good* at first, he makes *better*, by renewing and adopting them.'

"Is this all you have to say why there should be no odium raised on you about the baptism of infants? As if any of us had said that you deny that infants ought to be baptized. You do not say that they ought not to be baptized; but, according to your great wisdom, you say certain strange things. You say 'They are baptized in the sacrament of the Saviour; but yet they are not saved from any thing. They are redeemed by it, you say, and yet they are not delivered from any thing by it.'"

And at the end of the chapter, "They are strange things that you say; they are new things that you say; they are false things that you say. As strange, we are amazed at them; as new, we are shy of them; as false, we confute them."

And again (cap. 5) having produced a great many proofs that infants have need of the grace of Christ for acquitting them from the guilt of a corrupted nature, he says to Julian,

"If you would come to be of this mind, you would own the grace of Christ toward infants in its true and natural sense; and you would not be put to those shifts to say things impious and absurd, either that infants are not to be baptized, which, perhaps, you will hereafter say, or that so great a sacrament is in their case such a mockery, as that they are baptized in a Saviour, but not saved from any thing; that they are washed in the laver of regeneration, but have nothing washed off in it, &c.; and all this, because you are afraid to say they should not be baptized, lest not only the men should

spit in your faces, but the women also should throw their sandals at your heads."

In the sixth book (cap. 3) he puts Julian in mind of his own baptism in infancy; and how ungrateful a thing it is for him to disown the forgiveness of sin, that was granted to him therein. "Your good father," says he [St. Austin had been acquainted with his father] "ran with you, little thinking how ungrateful you would be for that mercy."

Though St. Austin does, over and over again, tell the Pelagians that nobody accused them of denying baptism to infants; yet it is probable it was him himself that meant to have raised that odium against them among the vulgar; for he speaks here and at other places, as if he thought they had a great mind to deny it, if they could have had the face. He had formerly in a sermon * (which he had preached against them, and which was published) after many things said to prove that infants have sin, and that it is for that they are baptized, added this: —

"Nemo ergo vobis susurret doctrinas alienas. Hoc ecclesia semper habuit semper tenuit; hoc a majorum fide percepit, hoc usque in finem perseveranter custodit; quoniam non est opus sanis medicus," &c.

'Therefore, let nobody whisper [*or insinuate*] any 'strange doctrines to you. This the church has always 'had, and ever held; this it has received from the 'faith of its antients; and this it keeps constantly to 'the end, that the whole have no need of a physician, '&c. — What need then has an infant, if he be not 'sick,' &c.

But whoever it were that had raised this report, the Pelagians did always carefully and industriously declare their disowning of any such thought or purpose; for as Pelagius, in his letter before rehearsed, declares that neither he himself, nor any one in the world that he

* Sermon 10, de Verbis Apostoli.

knew or had ever heard of, was ever so ignorant or so impious as either to say so, or have such a thought; so likewise Julian was so enraged against any that insinuated that he or his party denied, or ever meant to deny it, that he sticks not to anathematize all that deny it; for so are his words: —* "We are so far from denying it to be profitable to all ages, that we allot an eternal anathema to those that say it is not necessary, even for infants."

Yet Marius Mercator would needs have it, that their inward sense was against it; only, to keep up their credit with Christians, they, in words and declarations, owned it. This he goes about to prove by consequences from their other doctrines; and then says, † "So that it is plain you must think that they need not to be baptized, —only you impose upon us in your words; but in your heart you hold the impiety of Jews and Heathens." This was hard, when they made such protestations to the contrary. He had no other reason than that it would best have fitted with their other doctrines; but Mercator wrote his tract ten years after this of Julian; so that it could not be him that Julian meant.

Theodorus, who was at this time [331] bishop of Mopsuestia, in Cilicia, was in this question of the mind of the western Pelagians; and Julian, when he was deprived, retired to him. Some will have it, that he was elder in this sentiment than Pelagius himself. It might be so, for he was bishop from the year 392 [292] to 428 [328]. However that be, he seems to have concealed this, as well as some other heterodox tenets he had all his lifetime; they were discovered afterward by some writings he left. He had such singular opinions, especially about the authority of some books of Scripture, that he was, after his death, condemned in some General Councils for a heretic in greater points than this. This condemnation of him shews the weakness of the argument of a modern

* Apud Augustinum. Operis imperfecti, lib. 1, c. 51.
† Subnotationum in Scripta Julian. c. 8.

writer ‡, who would prove that the canon of Scripture was not settled in the church at this time, because he rejected some books of it. He shews that he did that, forgetting to tell us that he was therefore condemned as a heretic.

As for the book he wrote on the Pelagian side, there is a particular reason to conclude that it did not come abroad in the world till after St. Hierom and St. Austin were dead; because they never take any notice of it, though it be aimed chiefly against them two, without mentioning their names.

This book is not now extant; but an abstract of it is given by Photius *. If it be lawful to take a quotation at second-hand from any author, later than our period, it is from Photius: he was patriarch of Constantinople, *anno* 858 [758], and the collections of so learned and judicious a man are valued almost as much as if we had the originals.

The title of the book was, *Against them that say Men sin by Nature and not by Will.* There are particular reflections plain enough upon the two fathers I mentioned; but one of the opinions he there ascribes to his adversaries as an absurd one, is, "That infants, even when they are new-born, are not without sin, because our nature being by Adam's fall become sinful, that sinful nature is derived to all his posterity;" and one of the arguments he makes them use to prove it is this, "For what reason are the holy mysteries given to infants? Why are they accounted worthy of baptism [or proper to be baptized]? — but because they are full of sin, sin being implanted in their nature; for it is for forgiveness that these things are done to them."

The answer that he gives is, as Photius observes, the oddest that ever was given. He does not deny that they are baptized for forgiveness; but he says there is one sort of forgiveness which is for sins past; and another to procure a state for us in which we shall no more sin; and that is given partly in this life, and "perfectly (as

‡ Mr. Basnage. * Bibl. Cod. 177.

Photius recites his words) in that restoration which is to be after the resurrection; for the obtaining of which both we, and also new-born infants, are baptized." He gave himself a great latitude in the use of words, to call that *forgiveness*.

I mention this man only to shew that he, as well as the Pelagians of the west, took it for granted that infants are to be baptized, though he thought they have no sin; and even as for that opinion against original sin (whatever he thought or kept in writing by him) he found it necessary for him to join with the neighbouring bishops, in a synod held there, to condemn Julian and his opinions, as we understand by Mercator *.

After this time, the Pelagian opinions being so universally condemned, none but some very few and very desperate persons did venture to declare for them, or against original sin; but a considerable number did still oppose another opinion that St. Austin held, about particular predestination. These were called by their adversaries *Semi-Pelagians*, though they expressly renounced Pelagius as a heretic; and they called their adversaries *Predestinarians*; but as to the matter we are treating of they all agreed, That there is original sin in infants: that all baptized infants dying in infancy are saved; and, that no infant dying without baptism goes to Heaven.

The difference between them, as to the case of infants that die in infancy, was this: — St. Austin and his followers held, That God, by his mere gratuitous pleasure, does ordain that such or such infants shall come to have baptism, and so be saved; and others shall miss of it, without any regard had to the qualifications which they would have had if they had lived.

But the Semi-Pelagians, so called, said, That such infants as God foresaw would have been faithful Christians if they had lived, those he, by his providence,

* Præfat. in Symbolum Theodori.

procured to be baptized, and suffered others to miss of it.

So both agreed that, in both cases, salvation attends baptism.

This appears at large in the works of Prosper [344], Fulgentius [407], Cassian [324], and others of each party; and in the latter works of St. Austin himself, wherein he labours to expose his adversaries opinion as absurd, since God, who, in Scripture, is said to judge every one *according to what they have done*, is brought in by these men, as judging infants by what they did not do, but would have done, if they had lived; — and they answered, That this is more reasonable than to judge without any consideration at all.

He objects, that, according to their hypothesis, it is to little purpose which is said in the *Book of Wisdom* *, of one that died young, *He was taken away, lest wickedness should alter his understanding*, &c. if God will judge him according to what he would have done. To which they answer, That *that* is not *canonical* Scripture; and he does not go about to maintain that it is.

I shall have occasion to produce some of their sayings hereafter † (where I give some account of the opinion of the antients concerning the future state of infants dying unbaptized) and, therefore, omit them here.

In this dispute the Popes and clergy of Rome were generally zealous for the Predestinarian side; as Celestin [323], Sixtus [332], Leo [340], Hormisdas [414], &c. The other side found most abettors in France, especially about Marseilles.

---

* Chap. vi. 5, 11. † Part 2, ch. 6.

CHAPTER XX.

QUOTATIONS OUT OF ST. AUSTIN AND VINCENTIUS VICTOR.

[In the Year after the Apostles 319.]

THERE were no need of quoting any more out of St. Austin, either of the doctrine that he held, or of the testimony that he gives of the Churches practice in this time or before, were it not that this Vincentius, saying some new things about the case of infants that had never been said before, gave occasion to St. Austin also, who answered him, to insist on some new proofs and defences of the Catholic doctrine.

Vincentius seems to have been so inconsiderable a person, that his name would not have been remembered to the next generation, if he had not ventured to write against St. Austin; which now, by the books which that father vouchsafed to write in answer to him, which are four books, entitled *Of the Soul and its Origin*, is likely to be spoken of as long as the world lasts.

He was a young layman, remarkable for two things, — malapertness in judging and determining of controversial points; and a certain bombast in his style, which St. Austin *, out of his wonted civility and condescension, allows to be eloquent; and would make him believe, he might, if he would use his parts well, do God much service.

He was lately come off from the schism of the Donatists, which, about this time, mouldered away; but being of a restless head, could scarce keep clear of the heresy of the Pelagians, which had been (at the time when St. Austin wrote his first book against him) newly condemned; for so are St. Austin's words, † *Juxta Pelagianam hæresin, olim damnabilem, nuperrimeque dam-*

* Lib. 1, de Anima et ejus Origine, c. 2, 3.
† Ibid. c. 19.

natam: 'According to the Pelagian heresy, which 'always deserved condemnation, and is just now con-'demned.'

I take notice of this last circumstance, to set the time of this dispute right; for inasmuch as the year 418 was (as Bishop Usher expresses it) the fatal year for the Pelagian heresy (for it was in that year that the canons of the forementioned great Council of Carthage were published on May the 1st [318]; and the imperial edicts on April 30 [319]; and Pope Zosimus's circular letter a little after) this book of St. Austin's must probably have been written the latter end of that year, or the beginning of the next.

I shall by and by make some use of this observation about the year, in explaining a passage which will give some light to this observation, and receive some from it.

Vincentius wrote two books, chiefly against that opinion (to which St. Austin inclined) that the soul is by propagation. He owned * original sin, which was the most material point in which he differed from the Pelagians. The soul, he said, is a corporeal substance †; and so is the spirit (which he took to be different from the soul); on which St. Austin observes, That, according to him, a man consists of three bodies; but he granted that God is of an incorporeal nature; on which St. Austin says, ‡ "I am glad that in that point, however, he keeps free from the dotages of Tertullian." It is to be noted that Tertullian said That God also is a body, or else he would be nothing at all.

When he came to speak of that question, Whether the soul be propagated from the parent to the child, or be by immediate creation? — he determined, that it is immediately created; and withal expressed a great contempt of the dulness and ignorance of those that did at all doubt or demur on that question; and he reflected on St. Austin particularly and by name, as one that had confessed his inability to resolve it, because of that ob-

* Lib. 1, de Anima et ejus Origine, c. 9.
† Ibid. c. 5. ‡ Lib. 2, c. 5.

jection, How it could consist with God's justice to put a soul that is not derived from Adam, but is created pure, into the body of an infant, where it immediately contracts guilt and defilement?

We saw before * how much St. Austin was puzzled with this objection, and how St. Hierom, being desired by him, had refused to meddle with the solution of it; but now here Vincentius undertakes easily to answer it; but St. Austin shews that, unless he could have brought a more skilful answer, he had better have demurred too; and "were better have confessed his ignorance than betrayed his folly."

The answer he had given was this:—

First, In respect to such infants as do by God's providence come to have baptism, that † "they being by God's prescience predestinated to eternal life, it does them no hurt to continue a little while under the guilt of another's sin: that as the soul contracts a disease by sinful flesh, so sanctification [*viz. that of baptism*] is likewise conveyed to it by means of the flesh,—so that as by it the soul lost its merit [*or innocence*], by it also it recovers its state;— ‡ for shall we think that because it is the body that is washed in baptism, that [*benefit*] which is believed to be given by baptism, is not conveyed to the soul or spirit? Fitly, therefore, it does by the flesh recover its former disposition, which, by the flesh, it had seemed for a while to have lost, that it may begin to be regenerated by that by which it had been defiled; so § that though the soul, which could have no sin of its own, did deserve [*or had the fate*] to be made sinful, yet it did not continue in a state of of sin," &c.

Against this answer St. Austin objects, That if we examine it strictly, it makes God first do an ill thing in bringing an innocent soul into a sinful condition; and

* Chap. 15.
† Apud Augustin. lib. 1, de Anima et ejus Origin. c. 8.
‡ Lib. 3, c. 7. § Ibid. c. 8.

then make amends for it a little after by the grace of baptism. *Avertat* § *autem Deus et omnino absit, ut dicamus quando lavacro regenerationis Deus mundat animas parvulorum, tunc eum mala sua corrigere, &c.* 'But, God forbid, and far be it from us that we should 'say that God, when he cleanses the souls of infants by 'the washing of regeneration, does then make amends 'for his own faults,' &c. However, he says this is something; and may, after a fashion, serve for such infants as do come to be baptized. *De his* * *quidem parvulis invenit qualitercunque quod dicerit, &c.* 'He 'has found something to answer, after a fashion, for such 'infants.'

But the chief difficulty is about those that miss of baptism; of whom we are to see, in the next place, what Vincentius said.

2. In reference to such as are never baptized, he, in his first book (for he wrote two, as I said) determined thus: —

"† Habendam dicimus de infantibus istiusmodi rationem, qui prædestinati baptismo vitæ præsentis, antequam renascontur in Christo, præveniuntur occiduo, &c. Ausim dicere istos pervenire posse ad originalium indulgentiam peccatorum, non tamen ut cœleste inducantur in regnum. Sicut latroni confesso quidem, sed non baptizato, Dominus non cœlorum regnum tribuit sed Paradisum, cum utique jam maneret," &c.

'We must give some account of those infants which, 'being designed to be baptized in their life-time, are, 'before they be regenerated in Christ, prevented with 'death. I may venture to say that they may obtain 'forgiveness of their original sins, and yet not be admitted to the kingdom of Heaven. As our Lord 'granted to the thief, that owned him and was not baptized, not the kingdom of Heaven but *Paradise*; that 'sentence being in force, *He that is not born again of*

§ Lib. 1, c. 7. * Lib. 1, c 8.
† Apud. August. lib. 2, de Anima, &c. c. 9, 10.

'*water and the Holy Spirit, shall not enter into the* '*kingdom of Heaven*; especially when our Lord says 'that his Father has *many mansions;* by which are 'meant the many and different merits [*or rewards*] of 'those that shall dwell in them; so that there both the 'unbaptized may be admitted to pardon, and the bap-'tized to the crown which is procured by the grace.'

'For such infants indeed I give my opinion, that 'there be offered for them daily oblations, and conti-'nual sacrifices of holy priests. This I prove to be fit-'ting to be done by the example of the ‖ Maccabees 'that fell in the battle," &c.

On which determination of his, St. Austin, in the next words, makes this remark,

"Cernis hominem, Paradisum atque mansiones quæ sunt apud patrem, a regno separe Cœlorum; ut etiam non baptizatis abundent loca sempiternæ felicitatis," &c.

'You see how the man, that he may find places of 'eternal happiness for such as are not baptized, is fain 'to separate Paradise, and the mansions in God's 'house, from the kingdom of Heaven.'

And a little after, "How can he hope that he himself shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven, from which kingdom he excludes the house of the king himself to what distance he pleases?" And in the third book, written to Vincentius himself, he observes * "Christ does not say as you cite his words, My father has many mansions; and if he had said so they could not be understood to be anywhere but in his father's house: but he says expressly † In my father's house are many mansions."

And having a little after observed also that our Lord does not say ‡ *If any one be not born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of Heaven:* but *He cannot enter into the kingdom of*

‖ 2 Maccab. xii.
† John xiv. 2.
* Cap. 11.
‡ John iii. 3, 5.

God. He then concludes, "So, I suppose, you may by this time understand how wide from truth it is to separate any mansions in the house of God from the kingdom of God."

To the instance that Vincentius gives of the thief who went to Paradise, though not baptized, as he supposed, St. Austin answers §, shewing how extraordinary his case was; that he owning Christ at that time when they were putting both Christ and him to death, may well go for a martyr baptized in his own blood; that St. Cyprian reckons him as such: that moreover we are not sure but that he had been baptized, &c. and concludes,

"Verum hæc ut volet quisque accipiat; dum tamen de baptismo non præscribatur salvatoris præcepto hujus latronis exemplo; et non baptizatis parvulis nemo promittat inter damnationem regnumque Cœlorum quietis vel felicitatis cujuslibet atque ubilibet quasi medium locum."

'But of these let every one take which he pleases, 'always provided that the example of this thief be not 'made use of for a prescription against our Saviour's 'rule concerning baptism; and that no man do promise 'to unbaptized infants a place of rest and happiness of 'any sort, or anywhere, as a kind of middle place be-'tween condemnation and the kingdom of Heaven.'

But Vincentius, in his second book, went farther; for there, having reassumed the instance of the thief, and of one Dinocrates (a boy that died at seven years old; and a sister of his that survived, and suffered martyrdom, named Perpetua, had, while she lay in prison, a dream or vision, wherein she saw him in a place of darkness and misery; and afterward having prayed for his soul, she had another vision or dream, wherein she saw him in a place of happiness. This was recorded in a history † that was then 200 [100] years old, and is still extant); he says of the thief and of this Dino-

§ Lib. 1. c. 9. † Passio Sanctæ Perpetuæ et Felicitatis.

crates (who he supposes died unbaptized, because born of Heathen parents, as the story shews) that they, for all their want of baptism, obtained Paradise; and then adds, * "Or if any one do contend that the soul of the thief, or of Dinocrates, were placed in Paradise only for a time, and that they shall have, at the resurrection, the reward of the kingdom of Heaven, although that principal sentence, *He that is not born again of water*, &c. be against this, yet he shall have my willing assent, if this do more set forth the effect of the divine mercy and prescience, and our love of them." Shewing hereby, as St. Austin takes it, his opinion to be, that unbaptized infants also may, after staying some time in Paradise, attain, at the resurrection, to the kingdom of Heaven.

On which St. Austin says "Is it possible for any one to shew greater boldness, rashness, presumption of error in this matter? He remembers our Lord's sentence; he repeats it, — he sets it down in his book; he says 'Although that principal sentence, &c. be against this;' and yet he dares exalt the neck [*or pride*] of his own opinion against the principal sentence. I entreat you, brother, consider, whoever gives assent to any thing against the authority of the principal sentence, what sentence he deserves at the hands of the prince;" and at another place, ‡ "You do not consider how much worse you hold in this matter than Pelagius; for he, standing in awe of our Lord's sentence, by which unbaptized persons are not permitted to enter the kingdom of Heaven, does not dare send infants [viz. unbaptized ones] thither, though he think them free from all sin."

But St. Austin does here something stretch Vincentius's words; for he does not speak this expressly of infants, but of the thief and Dinocrates; and of them but doubtfully.

As to Dinocrates, St. Austin answers §,

* Apud August. lib. 2, de Anima, &c. c. 12.
‡ Lib. 3, c. 13. § Lib. 1, c. 10.

1. That the book that tells this story is no canonical book.

2. That Perpetua, or whosoever wrote it, does not say that he died unbaptized; for that, being seven years old, he might have been baptized by the procurement of somebody else, or by his own choice, though his father were a Heathen.

He might have answered farther (as Bishop Fell does * to some Papists that build the belief of Purgatory, and the duty of praying souls out of it, on this story) that here is no other evidence of Dinocrates being removed from torment to happiness, than a dream of Perpetua, who, as the bishop shews by some circumstances, was probably a Montanist; and they were a sect that attributed more to their dreams and revelations than to the Scripture. Nor does any author before Vincentius quote this book but Tertullian, who was himself a Montanist.

St. Austin shews also that Vincentius is the first that ever advised the Prayers of the Church to be used for any that had died unbaptized, or for any but Church-members. They had then, and so they had in Tertullian's † and Cyprian's time, a custom of commemorating, at the receiving of the Eucharist, the names of the faithful deceased, and of making some general prayers for them; such as "God rest their souls, and grant them a happy resurrection;" but nothing like those prayers which the Papists make for souls supposed to be in Purgatory; nor did they use them for any but baptized and faithful Christians; therefore, whereas Vincentius advises these prayers to be used as an after-remedy for such infants as had died without being partakers of baptism, St. Austin, on this account, says, ‡ "Do not believe, nor say, nor teach, that the sacrifice of Christians is to be offered for such as die unbaptized, if you will be a Catholic; for neither do you shew that *that* sacrifice

* Notis in Passionem Perpetuæ, &c. Edit. Oxon. 1680.

† Tertull. de Monogam. pro Anima ejus Orat. et Refrigerium, &c. ‡ Lib. 3, c. 12.

of the Jews, which you mention out of the books of the Maccabees, was offered for such as died uncircumcised; in which your opinion so new, and set up against the authority of the whole church," &c.

I have recited these passages the larger, and in Vincentius's own words, because there has been lately a hot dispute between Colonel Danvers, an Antipædobaptist, on one side, — and Mr. Baxter and Mr. Wills on the other, Whether this Vincentius denied infant baptism? You may judge by what I have rehearsed of Vincentius's own words, that the Colonel undertook a hard task; yet he maintained his post a great while, referring the reader for proof to Austin and Thomas Waldensis, which latter lived but about 300 years ago [1309]; but his antagonists searching and reciting the places to which he had referred, made it plain that neither of them had said any other thing of Vincentius's opinions than what is to the same purpose with that which I have here recited from himself. This had been enough to damp the courage of an ordinary man; but he being thus home-charged, and not used to yield, said at last, * "He denied it, as the denial of infant baptism went in those days, viz. that children might be saved without it." The sense of which words, if they have any, is this, That nobody in those days denied infant baptism any otherwise than by saying that children might be saved without it; which is to yield the whole matter in dispute about the practice of those times, for fear of seeming to yield in one particular.

The truth of the matter is, That if we except Tertullian (whose words I shewed before to be ambiguous and inconsistent) this Vincentius is the first man upon record that ever said that children might be saved without baptism, — if, by being saved, we mean going to Heaven; for that many before him thought they would be in a state without punishment, I have shewed before.

Vincentius does not speak positively neither; and that which he did say, he, some time after he had received

* Second Reply, p. 37.

these books of St. Austin wrote against him, recanted. This St. Austin lets us know in the Review of his own works, written seven years after this time *; for there, speaking of these books which he had wrote in answer to Vincentius, he adds, "Which young man I treated with all the mildness possible, as one that was not hastily to be detested, — but to be as yet instructed; and I received from him writings in answer, containing his recantation.

Here is a proper place to say something of that clause, which I said even now † is found in some copies of the Canon of the Council of Carthage, *anno* 418, annexed as a part of the second canon. It is this,

"Item placuit, ut si quis dicit ideo dixisse Dominum, *In domo Patris mei mansiones multæ sunt*, ut intelligatur, quia in regno Cœlorum erit aliquis medius, aut ullus alicubi locus ubi beate vivant parvuli qui sine baptismo ex hac vita migrarunt, sine quo in regno [l. regnum] Cœlorum, quod est vita æterna, intrare non possunt, anathema sit."

'Also it has seemed good to us, that if any one affirm that our Lord did, therefore, say *In my Father's house are many mansions*, that it should be meant, that there will be in the kingdom of Heaven any middle place, or any place anywhere, in which infants may live in blessedness that have died without baptism, without which they cannot enter into the kingdom of Heaven (which is all one as eternal life) he should be anathema.'

Most part of the copies have not, as I said before, this clause; but it is found in several. Mr. Du Pin mentions an old manuscript that has it; and says that Photius cites it; and that the *Codex*, published by Quesnellus, has it. Cardinal Noris quotes it, but thinks it spurious; and those Antipædobaptists that examined *Wills's Appeal against Danvers*, say that they find it in

* Retractat. lib. 2, c. 56. † Chap. 19.

the *Collectio Regia, tom.* 4, pag. 559. The critics have not, as I know of, given any account of this difference in the copies; of which I will here give my conjecture.

I believe the canon, as it was first enacted and published (which was, as I shewed before, in the Council in May 418) had not this clause; but F. Garner * and Bishop Usher before him †, have plainly shewn that there was in June, the next year, viz. 419, another Council of the bishops of all the provinces of Africa, in which the canons of the former council were read over and confirmed; and also (as Bishop Usher has it) "some peculiar matter against the Pelagian tenets enacted." He does not give any guess what that peculiar matter should be; but he proves that there was some such thing, partly from Prosper, and partly from this following passage of St. Austin, in his letter to Valentinus: — ‡ "What was written to Pope Zosimus from the African Council, and his letter to the bishops of all the world, and what we did in the following plenary Council of all Africa, enact in short against that error." That plenary Council which he calls the *following one*, and places after Zosimus's Letter, must have been in 419; since I shewed before that *that* letter was after the Council in 418.

I also shewed before, that this new fancy of Vincentius was published and canvassed in the time that passed between those two Councils, viz. in the latter end of the year 418, or in the beginning of the year 419; and it was published in Mauritania Cæsariensis, one of the African provinces; for there Vincentius lived, as St. Austin tells us §; and it had some followers; for he speaks of one Peter, a presbyter that, among others, embraced it.

I believe then that the canon of 418 had only so much as is in the ordinary copies; but that the bishops

* Dissert. de Synodis in Causa Pelagiana.
† Eccles. Brit. Antiq. c. 10. Prope finem.
‡ Epist. 47. § Retractat. lib. 2, c. 56.

meeting in 419, and understanding that this opinion had been, since their last meeting, vented in one of their provinces, to support by a new *salvo* the Pelagian hypothesis, they then added to the second canon, which spoke of the case of infants, this clause.

My chief reason is, Because this addition recites the very words of Vincentius; and does condemn them in almost the same words which St. Austin had used in the confutation of them; as will appear to any one that will turn back; and the fancy was so new and uncouth, that no Council could have thought of it, but on such a particular occasion.

I believe, the reason why most copies of that Council do now want this clause, is,

1. Because the canon, having been first published without it, many copies went abroad before that Appendix was added; — and,

2. Because the modern Church of Rome has set up an hypothesis so like this of Vincentius, and their *Limbus Infantum* does so nearly resemble his *feigned Paradise*, being as that was, a kind of *middle place*, that those of that church, who had the transcribing of copies, did not like well of an anathema denounced against such an opinion.

CHAPTER XXI.

NEITHER IRENÆUS, EPIPHANIUS, PHILASTRIUS, ST. AUSTIN, NOR THEODORET MENTION ANY SECT THAT DENIED INFANT BAPTISM.

[Year after the Apostles from 67 to 330].

THE Christians have always been of two sorts, viz. Catholics, who, though they inhabited several countries, yet did all own communion one with another, and so made one Catholic body or Church; and Sectaries or Heretics, who renounced the Catholic body aforesaid, and separated into several parties, on account of some tenets, opinions, or practices in religion, which they

held different from the Catholic Church; or sometimes merely on account of some quarrel with the governors thereof. The Church of Christ never was, nor ever in this world will be, so happy as to be without such sects and divisions; — but woe be to the men by whom they come!

The quotations hitherto produced do concern the practice of the Catholics in this matter of infant baptism, saving that here and there, by the by, there has been mention made of the tenets of some of the Heretics or Schismatics: as of the Donatists, chap. 9, 15, and 16; and of the Arians, chap. 12; and of the Pelagians, chap. 19, *per totum*. Of all whom it appears that they practised infant baptism as the Catholics did; and that without any difference of opinion concerning the use or effect of it, save that the Pelagians held that it was not for the cure of original sin, but for other purposes. Also, we saw in the said chap. 19 the several declarations of St. Austin, pleading that he had never heard; and of Pelagius, granting that he also had never heard of any sect or sort of Christians that denied infant baptism: and that which they two do say there in general, I find to be agreeable to the account that is given by all the rest that write histories of the several sects in particular, viz. That among all that vast number of sects, and their several opinions which they recite, they mention none that denied baptism to infants.

They do indeed each of them mention some sects that used no baptism at all; of which sects I do give a catalogue in the second part of this work *. St. Austin observes they were all of them such as disowned also the Scripture, or a great part thereof: but my meaning is, that of all the sects that owned any water baptism at all, they mention none that denied it to infants.

Now, since they do all of them make it their business to rehearse all the tenets, opinions, and usages, which these men held different from the Catholic party, and yet do mention no difference in this particular, one may

* Chap. 5.

conclude that they all of them practised in this particular as the Catholics did. If the Catholics had not baptized infants and the sectaries had, it would have been noted: and if the Catholics did baptize them, and the Sects had not, that also would have been noted: for they recite all that each sect had singular; and they mention differences of much less moment than this would have been. Now what evidence there is of the practice of the Catholics in this matter, must be left to be judged by him that has read the foregoing chapters; for the authors cited in them were all members of the Catholic Church, save that Tertullian afterward revolted from it, and Pelagius with his followers were excommunicated out of it.

The first treatise concerning sects or heresies that is extant, was written by Irenæus. He, about twenty years after St. John's death, was a hearer of Polycarp (St. John's disciple and acquaintance) at Smyrna [20]; and about forty-seven years after that, [67] was made bishop of Lyons in France; so that having lived and conversed in such distant countries, and with such men, he had an opportunity of knowing what sects there were, or had been. He wrote this tract about the year after the apostle's death 76 or 77, as I shewed before in ch. 3: he mentions the sects that arose in the time of the apostles, and those that had sprung up in the seventy-six years that had passed since their death.

They were all of them but a few in comparison of the number that arose afterward; but a great many, considering the time that had then passed. He takes most pains in refuting the Valentinians, who, it seems, were most numerous at that time and place: but, he says himself, that his purpose was to rehearse all that were, or had been, — which was easy to do for so short a space.

After much discourse against the Valentinians, he goes to prove that they derived their opinions, not from Christ or his apostles, but from the former heretics which had in the apostles' time set themselves against the apostles. These are his words *: —

* Lib. 1, c. 19.

"Since then that there is manifold evidence against all the sects, and that my purpose is to confute each of them according to their several tenets, I think it proper, in the first place, to recount from what fountain and original they sprung."

Then he declares how Simon the magician, mentioned by St. Luke *, was the first who, after he was rejected by the apostles, set up a sect, and taught that this world was made, not by the good and supreme God, but by inferior and evil powers; and proceeds in the following chapters to shew that this impious tenet made a main part in the doctrine, not only of the Valentinians, against whom he was principally engaged, but also of most of those elder ones that had followed Simon's example in setting up sects; — for the same thing was taught by Menander, Saturninus, Basilides, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, Cerdo, and Marcion, as well as by Valentinus: and so it was, after Irenæus's time, by Manes and the Manichees.

Of these heretics mentioned by him, the two first, Simon and Menander, do seem to have endeavoured to obliterate the memory of Jesus Christ; for each of them pretended himself to be † that great power of God [viz. *of the supreme God*] that was to redeem men from the malice and tyranny of that angel, or inferior God that made the world and gave the law.

The two next, Saturninus and Basilides, owned Jesus Christ that came in Judæa, but they owned only his divine nature ‡; for they said he was not really a man, nor did really die, but only in appearance.

The two next, Carpocrates and Cerinthus ‖, owned him to be a man and a Saviour, but not to be God, nor to have any being before his human birth; only, they said, a divine power from the supreme God came down at a certain time upon him, and dwelt in him, which enabled him to do what he did. This last opinion is now going to be revived.

---

* Acts viii. 9. † Irenæus l. 1, c. 20, 21. ‡ Ibid. c. 22, 23. ‖ Ibid. c. 24, 25.

All these three branches of heresy arose while St. John was alive; and so did the Ebionites and Nicolaitans, which he mentions * likewise. These did not join in the foresaid blasphemy against the Creator of the world, but had other abominable tenets. The Nicolaitans, chiefly in reference to practice, allowing fornication, &c. and the Ebionites, in point of faith, disbelieving the divinity of our Saviour (as the Cerinthians and Carpocratians) and renouncing and railing at the apostle Paul and all his writings, which do now make one half, and at that time made the much greatest part of the Scriptures of the New Testament; for St. John had not written when they set up their sect. This would make one stand amazed at the impiety of those men now-a-days, that, calling themselves Christians, would yet persuade us that these Ebionites were the true Christians of those times; that they were the orthodox; and those whom we call Catholics were erroneous. The tendency of such a tenet is to persuade us, together with the doctrine of Christ's divinity, to renounce also half the books of the New Testament. As St. John lived to see all these heresies vented, so one may perceive that he at several places of his writings opposes himself to such opinions.

Of sects that had arisen after the death of the apostles, he mentions † the Encratites, the Caians, the sects of Cerdo, of Marcion, and of Valentinus. The four last of these were an offspring of those first mentioned (who were by a general name called Gnostics) and did all agree with them in the point aforementioned, That the Maker of Heaven and Earth is not the supreme God; but that there is another far above him, and that it was that Upper One that sent the Saviour.

It was in opposition to this sort of heretics that the Catholic Church found it necessary to insert that clause, THE MAKER OF HEAVEN AND EARTH, into the first article of the Creed: for the most ancient Creeds had no more in that article than *I believe in God the Father*

* Iren. lib. 1, c. 26, 27. † Ibid. c. 28, 29, 30, 35.

Almighty. The Eastern Church, where those heresies were most rife, inserted it first, and the Latins from them. The Latins had it not in their Creed at the year 400. Without that clause the Manichees, Gnostics, &c. would say They believed in God the Father Almighty, but would mean a quite different God from him whom the Christians owned; who always meant the Creator of the world, and Author of the Old Testament, to be the same with the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

It pleased God by his providence so to order it, that though some heresies were very ancient, yet they are all so absurd, that they can tempt no man of ordinary sincerity that reads the Scriptures.

The points concerning baptism, in which Irenæus notes any of the said sects to have held any thing singular, are these: —

Menander promised * that all that would be baptized with his baptism [*or baptism in his name*] should presently have a resurrection, and after that should never die nor grow old, but be immortal: whereupon Tertullian, about 100 years after Menander's death, challenges † that sect to produce any of their fellows that had been baptized by Menander himself that were yet alive.

The Carpocratians ear-marked their proselytes; and that, as I understand Irenæus ‡, went for their baptism. "They burned a hole in the hinder part of the lap of the right ear." Here let me add a few of the next words, though not to this purpose: — "They call themselves Gnostics [*i. e. the men of knowledge*]; they use also certain images, some painted and some carved; and say they are pictures of Christ, drawn by Pilate, while Jesus lived among men. On these they put garlands, and set them up together with the images of the philosophers of the world, as Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle, &c.; and they use all such ceremonies to them as the Heathens do." These men, and some peo-

* Iren. c. 21. † De Anima c. 50. ‡ Lib. 1. c. 24.

ple at Paneas, mentioned by Eusebius* to have had the like Heathenish Fancy, as he calls it, are the first authors of the worship of Christ by an image that are anywhere mentioned. Epiphanius also mentions the ear-marks used by the Carpocratians. *Hær.* 27.

The Valentinians had several under-sects, of which Irenæus speaks particularly; and for their baptism, he says, † they had as many sorts of it as there were teachers among them; but all contrary to the true. Some, instead of baptism, dressed up a marriage-bed, and with certain profane words, acted a marriage of the person to Christ. Others put the person into the water indeed; but, instead of the Christian form of baptism, used a strange and uncouth one, which I have occasion to repeat at another place ‡, and anointed the baptized person with balsam. "There are some of them (says Irenæus) who think it needless to bring the person to the water at all; but, mixing oil and water together, they pour it on his head" [by which words of his, and by a thousand other instances, it appears that the Catholics did ordinarily put the whole body into the water] "and they use certain words, not much different from those I mentioned before; and they will have this to be redemption [*or baptism*]; and these also use balsam." Others of them use no water at all, nor other external ceremonies; but said Spiritual baptism, which consists in the "knowledge of the unspeakable Majesty," is all in all.

Some of them did pour oil and water on the heads of people newly dead, with such words and imprecations as he had before mentioned; and they told the dead man's soul what it should say, if, in its way to the supreme Heaven, it should meet with any of the principalities or powers that belong to him that made this world. The soul was to say That it was "better than the power that made them;" — and a great deal more such blasphemous stuff.

Irenæus excuses himself from descending to more

* H. E. lib. 7, c. 18. † Lib. 1, c. 18. ‡ Part 2, ch. 5.

particularities; for that they inventing every day new ways and opinions, it were endless to describe them all.

As to the Cerinthians and Marcionites he is very short, and says nothing about their baptism. But Epiphanius * speaks of a tradition that the Cerinthians did use to baptize some living person in the stead of any friend of theirs that had happened to die unbaptized; and that it was in relation to such a practice that the apostle says † *If there be no resurrection of the dead, why are they then baptized for the dead?* And St. Chrysostom, in his explication of that text, says that the Marcionites did the same. And Tertullian, in his fifth book against Marcion ‡, speaks of that custom, and the apostle's mentioning of it; but shews that his mentioning it is no evidence that he approved it. The comments ascribed to St. Ambrose do also so interpret the place.

There are two objections against that interpretation.

1. One is, that the Marcionites for certain, and probably the Cerinthians, were not in being when that apostle wrote. Cerinthus had a party before St. John's death; but this epistle of St. Paul was a long time before that.

Therefore, Scaliger and others think that some zealous but ignorant people among the Catholics, had, upon a sense of the necessity of baptism, begun this custom in St. Paul's time; and that in the Catholic Church it was quickly left off, but that it was continued afterward among the Cerinthians and Marcionites.

2. The other is, that St. Paul would not probably draw an argument for the resurrection of the dead from so weak a topic as the practice either of abominable heretics or mistaken Christians.

But these men do not seem to have minded that St. Paul does sometimes take in the suffrages even of heathen men in his arguings: he might reasonably enough propose to himself to shame those among the Christians at Corinth that did not believe the resurrection, by in-

* Hær. 28. † 1 Cor. xv. 29. ‡ C. 10.

stancing in the general assent that was given to that article among all Christians, and even among those who, how much soever they might be mistaken in thinking that *that* vicarious baptism would avail the dead, yet did plainly shew that they fully believed the resurrection of the dead when they practised this sort of baptism for them.

This interpretation is certainly the most obvious; and it is something confirmed by the ill success of those that have attempted any other: that *baptized for the dead* should stand instead of *baptized for their bodies* *; or that *for the dead* should be construed *for the state of the dead* †; or *for their dead Adam* ‡; or, *Why are they baptized for the dead? i. e.* Why are persons ready to die desirous of baptism, that it may be well with them after they are dead ||? Or, that ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν should be translated *over the dead*; *i. e.* Why do people choose to receive their baptism at the tombs of dead martyrs §? Or, that *baptized for the dead* should mean nothing but washed after the touch of a dead body ¶. These are the essays of learned men: but the more one observes the apostle's phrase, the less probable they appear.

The latest that has been given is, I think, the worst: Why are they baptized for the dead? That is, Why are new Christians baptized every day in the room of those that die **? for that fits neither the phrase nor the scope of the place.

Ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν for ὑπὲρ τὴν τῶν νεκρῶν ἀνάσασιν ††
'upon the faith of the resurrection of the dead,' would fit the sense very well; but it is a great stretch of the words. *Baptized for the dead,* i. e. *buried under water for dead,* or as if they were dead ‡‡, is a mere Anglicism, that would never in Greek have been expressed by ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν, but ὡσεὶ νεκροί.

---

* Tertullian contra Marcion. lib. 5, c. 10. † Chrysost. in loc. ‡ Vossius de Baptismo, Disp. 12. th. 2. || Epiph. Hær. 28. § Pruden. Hymn. 8. ¶ Vasquez in tertiam, Disp. 157. ** Mr. Le Clerc. Annot. in loc. †† Hammond in loc. ‡‡ Sir Norton Knatchbull.

St. Chrysostom's objection * against this sense of the place, that St. Paul should refer to such a custom among some Christians, is this:— "If Paul meant so, to what purpose is the threatening of God against one that is not baptized? For if this shift" [viz. of a living person to be baptized for one that is dead] "be admitted, none will ever miss of baptism; or, if they do, it will be the fault of those that survive, and not of the dead person." But St. Chrysostom does not seem to have considered that (as Tertullian says) the apostle might mention this custom without approving it. Though a mistaken practice, yet it shewed still the faith of the resurrection.

The Marcionites had also several other singular opinions about baptism. They would baptize no married person till he did divorce his wife; for they said That marriage and all the works thereof were wicked things, and were ordered by that evil god or angel that gave the law and made mankind! Hence Tertullian jeers them, saying, † That they "reserved a man's baptism till he was divorced or dead."

What Irenæus here says of one sort of the Valentinians, that they baptized some persons after they were dead, Philastrius says ‡ was the common tenet of the Montanists or Cataphryges. *Hi mortuos baptizant*, These baptize people after they are dead. There were also here and there some in the Catholic Church, who, through a mistaken zeal and compassion to persons that died unbaptized, would sometimes do the same: for there is a canon in the third Council of Carthage against that practice. That Council allows sick people to be baptized, though they be speechless, if there be good evidence of their fitness and desire of it §. But yet they say ‖ Let not any priests be so ignorant as to think that dead persons may be baptized.

Inasmuch as Irenæus, among all these observations, says nothing *pro* or *contra* about baptizing infants

* In loc. † Contra Marcionem, lib. 4, c. 11. ‡ Hær. Cataphrygum. § Canon 31. ‖ Canon 6.

among the heretics, it may, as I said, be concluded that they had nothing singular in that point, but practised as the Catholics did: and for the Catholics, I produced before * the saying of Irenæus himself, where he speaks of infants being, as well as grown persons, the ordinary subjects of regeneration; and that by *regenerated*, he and all the antients did understand *baptized*. Whatever pains might be necessary to shew it then in that chapter, I suppose there is none needful now, because the reader has since that, seen that all the authors do speak in that language.

The other four, Epiphanius, Philastrius, Austin, and Theodoret, were all living at one time; only Epiphanius was the eldest, and Theodoret the youngest. I shall not with these take the same pains as I did with Irenæus, of setting down all the customs or tenets that they recount the several sects to have held different from the Catholics in the matter of baptism, it would be too voluminous; it is sufficient that they do none of them mention any thing concerning infant baptism either as practised, or as not practised, by any of the Sectaries (a plain proof that they held nothing in that point different from the ordinary practice of the church) save that St. Austin notes of the Pelagians (which is in his account the 88th and last heresy that had risen) that though they agreed with the church that infants are to be baptized, yet they held a different opinion concerning the ground or reason of their baptism. His words are these: —

† "Parvulos etiam negant secundum Adam carnaliter natos contagium mortis antiquæ prima nativitate contrahere. Sic enim eos sine uno peccati originalis vinculo esserunt nasci, ut prorsus non sit quod eis oporicat secunda nativitate dimitti; sed eos propterea baptizari, ut regeneratione adoptati admittantur ad regnum Dei," &c.

'They do also deny that infants which are descended 'from Adam, according to the flesh, do, by their first

* Ch. 3. † Lib. de Hærenibus, c. 88.

'birth, contract any contagion of the anciently threat-
'ened death (for they affirm them to be born without
'any bond of original sin) so that there is nothing in
'them that needs to be forgiven by the second birth;
'but that they are baptized for that reason, that being
'by this regeneration adopted, they may be admitted
'to God's kingdom, being by this renewal advanced
'from a good state to a better, but not absolved from
'any ill state of the old obligation: for though they be
'not baptized, these men do promise them a certain
'eternal and happy life, not in the kingdom of God in-
'deed, but of a peculiar sort.'

This was the only sect that he knew of, he says*, that denied infant baptism to be for original sin; and for any that denied it absolutely, he knew of none at all.

Mr. Tombs, being to answer Mr. Marshal, who had produced a great many of the fathers that speak of infants as baptized, makes this exception, That there are several others of them that have nothing at all of that matter. "It is a wonder to me (says he) † that if it were so manifest as you speak, you should find nothing in Eusebius for it, nor in Ignatius, nor in Clemens Alexandrinus, nor in Athanasius, nor in Epiphanius.

The objection is but weak; for there is no age of the church in which one may not find many books that say nothing of that matter; because they treat of subjects on which they have no occasion to speak of that. Ignatius wrote nothing but a few letters to the neighbouring churches, to exhort them to constancy in that time of persecution; Athanasius was wholly taken up about the Trinity; Clemens Alexandrinus with the Heathen philosophers; yet in him we have now found a place where he, in a transient and cursory way, mentions the apostles baptizing infants. Eusebius writes the Chronicles of the succession of kings, emperors, bishops, and the state of the church, either flourishing or persecuted, under each of them.

---

* See chap 19. † Examen. p. 9.

But I think Mr. Tombs could not well have said a more unlucky thing for his own cause, than to instance Epiphanius; for since he wrote nothing to speak of, but a catalogue of those opinions which the several sectaries held contrary to the church, to plead that he says nothing of infant baptism, is in effect to give an argument that there never was any sect that in that matter practised otherwise than the church did in Epiphanius's time, who died after the year 400 [300]; and that the church at that time used infant baptism is so plain, that the Antipædobaptists do seldom deny it.

Mr. Tombs gives an instance of a case in which he thinks it would have been proper for Epiphanius to have mentioned infant baptism, if it had then been in universal use in the church; for Epiphanius gives an account * of a sect that had began about 100 years before, called *the Hieracites*, who taught that no infant dying before the use of reason, could come to the kingdom of Heaven. Their reason was, *If any one strive, he is not crowned, except he strive lawfully* †. How much less can an infant be crowned, who never strives at all! They thought of the kingdom of God in Heaven, as the Antipædobaptists do of his kingdom on earth, that it is no state for babes. Now, Mr. Tombs thinks that Epiphanius, among the arguments he brings, that infants may be glorified, would have pleaded their baptism, if the baptizing them had been usual in the church.

But he seems not to have considered that heretics and schismatics do not use to be prevailed on by arguments drawn from the practice or doctrines of the church; and as for arguments from Scripture, Epiphanius uses those that do more expressly and immediately prove their admission into the kingdom of God; as that saying of our Saviour, *Of such is the kingdom of God*, &c. and is but short in all.

It might be objected again, That in all probability these heretics did not baptize their own children. If they did, it could be only in prospect of some benefit

* Hær. 67. † 2 Tim. ii. 5.

it might do them afterward, if they lived; and if they did not baptize them, it had been proper for Epiphanius to mention that, as a thing wherein they differed from the Catholics, supposing that the Catholics did baptize theirs.

But upon a more careful reading of their opinions there rehearsed, it appears that they could have no children; for one of their tenets was, That all marriages and getting of children is unlawful under the New Testament; and that "no married person can inherit the kingdom of God: that the only end of Christ's coming was to settle an absolute continence; — for what new thing did he bring into the world else? Against malice, covetousness, injustice, fornication, &c. the law had well enough provided before."

Whether these men would have baptized their children, if they had *had* any, is uncertain; but the first body of men we read of that did deny baptism to infants, which were the Petrobrusians, *anno Dom.* 1150 [1050], did it upon a ground or reason which they held common with these men, viz. That infants, baptized or not baptized, are incapable of the kingdom of Heaven, as I shew in the Second Part of this work, ch. 7.

Epiphanius reckons in all eighty heresies [274]; which he says * "were all that he heard of in the world." — He says nothing of their baptizing or not baptizing infants; but in the end of his work he recites the faith held by the church, in opposition to all heresies. In settling the articles of faith he is large; but he has also a few words concerning the rites of the church. He mentions the fasts and feasts, &c.; and he adds, "As for the other ordinances, concerning baptism and the internal mysteries, as the tradition of the Gospel and of the Apostles is, so they are ordered;" and after some mention of the manner how the Catholic Church uses the Prayers, Psalms, ways of relieving the poor, &c. he adds, "And for baptism, she [the Catholic Church] accounts it to be in Christ [or to the Christians] instead

* Hær. 80.

of the old circumcision." The like he says in his eighth chapter, which is of the Epicureans: — "The Law had the patterns of things in it; but the truth of them is in the Gospel. The law had the circumcision in the flesh, serving for a time, till the great circumcision came, that is, baptism; which circumcises us from our sins, and seals us unto the name of God.

Philastrius [280] makes above 100 heresies. He makes a difference in opinion about any trifling matter, to be a heresy. He mentions no dispute about infant baptism.

Theodoret [330] has wrote in the best method about heresies. He has reduced them to some general heads; he makes four. The first, Of those before mentioned, and such others as have denied that the world was made by God; — the second, Of those that have attributed to our Saviour no other nature than the human. The other two of other sects. He says, The first sort had at that time hardly any that adhered to them; and the second sort none at all. He mentions some sects that used no baptism at all; but it was only some of the most absurd and impious; but of those that used baptism, he has none that renounced infant baptism. After the four books of these four sorts of heresies, he adds a fifth; which is "Of the True and Orthodox Doctrines and Usages of the Church." He mentions there the baptism of infants, not as a thing disputed of, or denied by any sect; but occasionally. Shewing the advantages of baptism, that it conveys not only pardon for the sins of men's former life, but many other graces, he proves it by the baptism of infants, who have committed no sin. The words I had occasion to recite before, in chap. 14. There is another catalogue of heresies at the end of *Tert. de Præscript*; but it hath nothing about baptism, save that Menander said None could be saved that were not baptized in his name.

CHAPTER XXII.

CONTAINING REFERENCES TO THE BOOKS OF SOME AUTHORS OF THE NEXT SUCCEEDING TIMES.

[Year after the Apostles from 300 to 400.]

THIS is the best account I can give of the passages concerning infant baptism, that are in the genuine books of the writers that flourished from the Apostles' time to the year of Christ 400. The reason that I go no farther is, Because, for the next 700 years, the matter is clear; yet of those years, and of the Waldenses that arose about the year 1150 [1050], I intend to discourse something in general in the Second Part of this work *.

And here, for the sake of those that have any mind to trace the quotations for about one hundred years farther, I have set down some references to the places where they are to be found. To set down the words is too long [344]; they being all to the same effect with those already rehearsed.

Prosper, in almost all his works against the Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian tenets, makes use of the argument taken from the necessity of the baptizing of infants. Particularly,

Epist. ad Augustinum, prefixed to St. Austin's book *de Prædestinatione Sanctorum.*

Epist. ad Demetriadem, among the Works of St. Ambrose.

De Vocatione Gentium, lib. 1, c. 16, 22; lib. 2, c. 20, 21, 22, 23, &c. I know it is questioned whether this be Prosper's, or Pope Leo's, or some other man's work; but it is much one to this purpose, since, whoever he were, he lived about this time.

Carmen de Ingratis, cap. 1, 6, 21, 30, 31, &c.

---

* Part 2, ch. 7.

Contra Collatorem.

Epist. ad Rufinum, circa Medium.

Defensio Augustini.

Orosius Apologetic. [316].

Paulinus Diaconus, Libello ad Zosimum Papam. [320].

Hilarius Arelatensis, Epist. ad Augustinum. [330].

Marius Mercator, Commonitorii, c. 1 *et* 4. [318].

Præfatione ad Subnotationes.

Subnotat. c. 6, *item* 8.

Cælestinus Papa Epist. ad Maximian. apud Acta Concilii Ephesini. [323].

Epist. ad Gallos Episcopos.

Epistola Synodica Concilii Ephesini ad Cælestinum Papam. [331].

Autor Prædestinati, a Sirmondo editus. Par. 1643. [335].

Possidius in Vita Augustini. [330].

Autor Hypognosticων, inter Opera Augustini, lib. 4, 5, *et passim.* [330].

Isidorus Pelusiota, lib. 1, epist. 125; lib. 3, epist. 195, &c. [312].

Cassianus de Incarnatione Domini, lib. 5, c. 11. [324].

Cyrillus in Levitic. c. 8. [312].

Theodoretus in 1 Cor. vii. 14. [323].

Epitome Decret. Divin. lib. 5.

Leo Magnus Papa, Epist. 37, *ad Neonem.* [340].

Epist. 92, *ad Rusticum,* cap. 16.

Epist. 86, *ad Nicetam Aquilejiensem, item Epist.* 88, *ad Episcopos Germ.*

All these were contemporary with St. Austin, but younger than he, and wrote before the year 450; and in the next fifty or sixty years, these following: —

Faustus Reinsis (one of those then called *Semi-Pelagians*) *de lib. Arbitrio,* lib. 1, c. 1, 2, 14. [372].

Gennadius (one of the same) *de Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus,* c. 52. [395].

And his interpolator, a Predestinarian, c. 31.

Fulgentius, a Predestinarian, *de Veritate Prædestinationis*, lib. 1, *per totum*. [407].

De Incarnatione et Gratia Jesu Christi, c. 15, *item* 30.

De Fide ad Petrum, c. 27, 30, &c.

De Remissione Peccatorum, lib. 1, c. 14.

Epistola Synodica Episcoporum in Sardinia exulum, B. P. Col. 1618, *tom.* 6. *De Prædestinatione et Gratia*, c. 3.

Joannes Maxentius. Catholica de Christo Professio, prope fidem, B. P. tom. 6. [420].

The Council of Gerunda, can. 5. [417].

The Council of Ilerda, can. 13. [424].

Ferrandus's (a deacon of Carthage) *Letter to Fulgentius, about the Baptism of a certain Negro.* [428].

Fulgentius's Answer. [428].

The substance of this last-mentioned letter, and the answer to it, is this: — A gentleman of Carthage had bought a Negro slave, that had been brought out of the inmost and savage part of Africa, where Christianity was not then, nor is yet known. His master had caused him to be instructed in the faith: he was a catechumen for some time; and at last was admitted among the competents for baptism. He had rehearsed in the congregation the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, &c.; and had made the usual renunciations of the Devil, &c. as the custom of that church was for the competents to do some days before their baptism; and at the time of baptism they used to do it, by way of answer again; but just before the time in which he was to be baptized, he fell sick of so sudden and violent a fever, that at the time of baptism he was speechless, and without sense. They baptized him however. "And we (says Ferrandus) answered in his name, as if it had been for an infant; and he dying presently after, never understood, I believe, that he was baptized. Now I intreat your opinion, Whether his want of speech will be no hindrance to his obtaining eternal salvation? For I am much afraid lest our Lord, to whom all things are possible, did, therefore

deny him the faculty of speech, because he thought him unworthy of the benefit of the second birth; for how that age of his, that was capable of reason, could be cleansed by another's confession, I do not see; for it is infants only, who have no sin but original sin, whom we believe to be saved by the faith of those that bring them, &c.; and if it be said, That the confession he made before, when he was well in his senses, will avail for his forgiveness, I do not see how we can stand to that; for then another will conclude, that he would have been saved if he had no bodily baptism at all; and at that rate, Why might we not baptize people after they are dead, if they be such whose devout and faithful purpose was known before? I know the ordinary canon * prescribes, that sick persons, that are not able to make the answers, may be baptized, provided their friends will, at their own peril, testify that they had such a purpose before their sickness. This indeed justifies the minister in giving the baptism; but I make some question concerning the benefit that such a person receives by it."

The answer which the Bishop Fulgentius gives to this scruple, tends all toward the comforting Ferrandus concerning his doubt of the man's salvation. He argues, That all the condition required by our Saviour for adult persons, being, that they should *believe and be baptized.* This man had both. That faith and the profession of it are the act of the man; the baptizing him is the act of the minister;—and though this man had not his senses when the minister performed his act, yet he had when he himself performed his own: that God's taking away his senses was not so great a sign of his rejecting him, as the continuance of his life, till he could be baptized, was of his receiving him. "It is true (says he) that we believe none but infants are saved by the faith of those that bring them, &c.; and that, in the age of reason, one's own confession is required, &c.; but this man had his senses when he professed, and he had yet life when he was baptized."

* Concilii Carthag. Tertii Can. 34.

He grants in the following discourse that if he had died before he had been actually baptized, he could not have been saved; which is very hard, and contrary to the determination of St. Ambrose and other fathers in a like case, as I shew in my Second Part *.

The reason why I recite this at large, rather than the other passages to which I have given references, is not that this speaks more plainly than the rest about infant baptism; on the contrary, the rest speak more directly to that matter than this does; but I recite it, that the earnest concern that this master, minister, and bishop do shew for the salvation of this poor slave may fly in the face, and strike with shame and terror the consciences of such profane traders of our nation as, having plantations in the West Indies, do keep hundreds of such negroes, and are so far from any concern for their souls, that, on the contrary, they do all they can to hinder them from Christian faith and baptism, and discourage those that would procure them means of it.

I do not conceive that all the masters there are of this temper; but for those that are, and are resolved to continue so, as I doubt they have but little belief of the truth of the Scripture, so it were for their interest that it were not true; for there is nothing plainer by the tenor of it, than that such masters are in God's sense a much worse sort of Heathens than their slaves, and liable to a far greater condemnation; and that, beside their own personal sins, the blood of those poor creatures will be required at their hands. I would crave leave to recommend to these gentlemen the reading of a little book, published about 20 years ago, by a clergyman that had lived in Barbadoes, called *The Negro's and Indian's Advocate.*

That I may tell the reader in short the substance of the places to which I have referred him, they do all speak of infant baptism as of a thing taken for granted; and those of them that do at all enlarge on the matter,

* Ch. 3, *item* ch. 6.

do speak of it as absolutely necessary to the infant's obtaining the kingdom of Heaven; and this, whether they be of the Predestinarian or Semi-Pelagian opinion; and I am confident there is no passage in any author from this time to the year of Christ 1150 [1050], or thereabouts, that speaks against it, save that Walafridus Strabo, about the year 850 [750] (though he were for infants baptism, and thought it necessary for their salvation, yet) gave his singular opinion, that it had not been practised from the beginning, but had come into use first in St. Austin's time; which, how palpable a mistake it was, I suppose every reader is by this time satisfied. I give you his words hereafter *; and, save that Mr. Stennet produces one Macaire, an unknown author, living in the ignorant times, who talks much as Strabo does; of whom I must also speak hereafter †.

CHAPTER XXIII.

QUOTATIONS OUT OF SOME BOOKS THAT ARE SPURIOUS: NOT WRITTEN BY THOSE WHOSE NAME THEY BEAR; BUT YET ARE PROVED TO BE ANCIENT.

[Year after the Apostles 300.]

Let the first of these be that out of the book called *Clement's Constitutions.* They are called his, because he is feigned to have been the compiler of them from the mouths of the apostles. The history of which book, as near as learned men have traced it, is this: —

There were, in the very early times, certain traditionary accounts handed about, as the preachings, doctrines, or rules that had been delivered by such or such an apostle or apostolical man; something like the shorthand notes of sermons, which it was the late custom

* Part 2, ch. 2. † Part 2, ch. 2.

in England to take from the mouths of celebrated preachers. One of which would be called, for example (Διδαχὴ Πέτρου) 'the Doctrine of Peter;' another (Διδασκαλία Κλήμεντος) 'the Preaching of Clement,' &c.; and several of these being by some studious persons collected and put together, were entitled (Διατάξεις Αποστόλων) 'The Rules or Constitutions of the Apostles.'

If they had been all of them judicious and sincere persons that first took these notes of the preachings or sayings of the apostles, and they that collected them into volumes had been the like, there is no doubt but the collections would have been highly valuable; and as they are, they do, for the most part, consist of pious rules and exhortations; but, according to the various memories, or judgment, or honesty of the first recorders, or after-compilers, these compositions were in many things various, uncertain, and, by men of different inclinations, differently interpolated, and so of no authority.

In Eusebius's time, *anno* 320 [220], there was a volume of this nature, called (Κιδαχαὶ Αποστόλων) 'Doctrines of the Apostles' [270], which he reckons * among the spurious books. Epiphanius, fifty years after, cites a book called *Constitutions of the Apostles*; which he says was of doubtful credit; and it has also been altered since his time. About the year 400 [300] it seems to have been liked and brought into that form of eight books, in which we now have it, and to have been set forth with that confident title, as if the whole had been put into form by St. Clement. This is confirmed by the quotations of it by the author of the *Opus imperfect. in Mat.* who lived about that time.

Hence it appears that, for any particular clause or chapter of it, one does not know how long, or how little while before the year 400 it has been inserted. The clause to the present purpose is this: —

* Eccl. Hist. lib. 3, c. 25.

Constitut. Apostolic. lib. 6, cap. 15.

The apostles are there brought in speaking; and after they have disallowed of such as baptize twice, and also set forth the wickedness of those that despise all baptism, they say,

"And he that says I will be baptized when I am going to die, that I may not sin after it, and defile my baptism, — such a man has no true knowledge of God, and is ignorant of his nature; for *delay not thou to turn to the Lord; for thou knowest not what to-morrow will bring forth.*

And then they add,

Βαπτήζετε δὲ ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ νήπια, καὶ ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νουθεσίᾳ Θεοῦ. Ἄφετε γὰρ φησὶ, τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με, καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά.

'And baptize your infants, and bring them up in the 'nurture and admonition of God; for he says, *Suffer 'the little children to come unto me, and forbid them 'not.'*

How little assurance soever there is from the credit of this book, that these are the apostles words; yet they shew that it was the received doctrine at the time when they were put into the book.

The quotation of the book of *The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, is commonly thought worth the while by those that write on this subject; otherwise I, for my part, should hardly think it worth the setting down.

Partly because of the abhorrence one should have of so gross and impudent a forger, who having, about the year 400, [300] if not later, composed some books remarkable for nothing but affected high-flown expressions, thought them fit to be fathered upon Dionysius, the Areopagite, mentioned in Acts xvii. 34; unless we are to think that the author himself was not guilty of this imposture; but that somebody else, having got the copies of these books into his hands, did thrust in here and

there a sentence, which should represent that Dionysius as the author; which I have sometimes thought.

And partly because what he says on this subject seems to me spoken with less judgment than usual, — towering in words, but shallow in sense.

I shall forbear setting down the original (for it is not worth reciting twice) only give the translation of his bombast Greek in as plain English as I can.

He, in this treatise, gives an account of the several rites used at the Eucharist, at ordinations, &c. and, among the rest, at baptism (which he generally calls by the name of the *Divine Birth)* and of the reasons of them. What he has of baptism does mostly concern the baptism of the adult, and their professions. What he says of the baptism of infants, is in answer to the objections the Heathens made against it, and is as follows: —

Ecclesiastic. Hierarch. cap. 7, *in fine.*

" But that children also, who cannot yet understand the divine mysteries, should be made partakers of the divine birth, and of the most sacred signs of society with God, does seem, as you say, to men that are profane and ill-affected to our religion, a thing fit to be laughed at: that the bishops should teach the holy things to those that are incapable of them, and should bestow the things which by sacred tradition they have received, upon such as have no sense of them; and, what is more ridiculous, that others should pronounce the renunciations and holy professions for them in such a fashion as if they were doing it for themselves.

" Now, your episcopal wisdom ought not to be angry with those that are in error; but to answer their objections with a religious meekness, for their instruction and edification; adding this also as from our holy religion, That our knowledge is not able to comprehend all divine things; and that a great many things which we cannot understand, have really reasons that are worthy of God, unknown to us, but known to the higher beings;

and even those higher natures are ignorant of many things which are known only to the All-wise Deity, the Author of all wisdom.

"And yet, as to this particular matter, that we do say the same things which our divine ministers of holy things have delivered down to us as they were taught them from ancient tradition; for, they say, and it is true, that children, if they be brought up to holy rules and institutions, will come to be of a good temper of mind, free, and disentangled from all error, and out of the danger of an unclean life. Our divine instructors considering this, have thought fit that children should be admitted after this holy manner.

"That the natural parents of the child which is brought, should deliver him to some one that is himself baptized, as to a good instructor in the things of God; and that the child should afterward learn of him, as of his father in God and his sponsor, in things that are for salvation; and then of this person who undertakes to instruct the child in holiness of life, the bishop does demand, as I may call it, the Declaration of his Renouncing, and the other holy professions; not that he does (as they jeeringly represent it) initiate the one in the other's stead in the holy rites; for he does not say thus: 'I do, in the stead of this child, renounce or promise,' &c.;—but, 'This child does renounce, profess, &c. that is, I promise to persuade this child, when he shall come of age, to understand the holy things, by my religious instructions, to renounce the adverse powers, and keep clear from them, and to profess and fulfil the divine proposals.'

"It is, therefore, as far as I can see, no absurdity that the child should be entered into the divine life; whenas he has a guide and sponsor that will instruct him in the knowledge of divine things, and keep him safe from the adverse powers; and the bishop does make the child partaker of the holy mysteries, that he may be educated according to them, and may lead no other life but such as has always a regard to those divine things, and an agreement with them, and is in an

holy manner habituated to them; and to this he is led by his divine Sponsor."

His mentioning Ancient Tradition in this matter, would make one think, what I hinted before, that the author had no purpose of putting on the vizor of Dionysius, the Areopagite; for to make him talk of Ancient Tradition in any thing of Christianity, which was all new in his time, was to betray his own cheat. Beside, it is not in this book of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* that there are any tokens of its being written by Dionysius; but only in some of the other books of the same author.

The interpretation he gives of the professions made by the Godfathers is very singular: he will not have it that the Godfather does renounce, profess, &c. in the child's name or stead; but both the antients generally, and the moderns, do so understand it as that he does; but, perhaps, both of these may be reconciled. The Godfather does not profess in the child's stead, so as that the Godfather's performance of those professions should be instead of the child's performance of them; and in this sense this author denies it; but the Godfather does profess in the child's stead, so as to declare the obligation of the child to perform, and does in his name own that obligation, and make the promise; and in this sense the other antients affirm it. To the intent it may more fully be declared that the benefits of baptism are conveyed to the child not absolutely, but on condition that, if he live, he do perform his part of the covenant, the Godfather expresses those things that are the child's part; as if a great benefactor will settle a large estate of inheritance on a child, upon condition that he pay a small quit-rent in acknowledgement. This is so beneficial to the child, that there ought to be no doubt of his acceptance. The contract is, therefore, made in the child's name; and because he is not of age, his guardian seals it in his stead. This the Church of England does more plainly express, who put the words thus: *Dost thou, in the name of this child, renounce?* &c.;

and so did the antients, who put them thus, *Does this child renounce?* &c.

As for the age in which these books were written, it is best gathered from Photius, who gives the abstract of a book written by Theodorus Presbyter, wherein he pretended to maintain that these books are the genuine work of Dionysius, the Areopagite, against some that then opposed the authenticity of them. The man must have had a hard task; but yet it is a proof that they were known then, and for some time before. This Theodorus lived, as Dr. Hammond says *, *anno* 420; but others place him much later, in the seventh century.

There does not lie any such prejudice for any design of forgery against the author of the *Quæstiones ad Orthodoxes*, which commonly go among the works of Justin Martyr; only that piece going about, as it seems, without the name of the author, somebody in the early times ascribed it to him. It cannot be his, because it makes mention of Irenæus, and of Origen, who lived something after his time, unless those passages that mention Irenæus and Origen have been, since the first writing of the book, foisted into it. I shall not pretend to guess at the time of the writing of it, — only it is known to be ancient. The passage I would quote is this: —

Questiones ad Orthodoxos. Quæst. 56.

"Εἰ τὰ τελευτῶντα βρέφη ἔπαινον ἢ μέμψιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξ ἔργων, τίς ἡ διαφορὰ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν ὑπὸ ἄλλων μὲν βαπτισθέντων καὶ μηδὲν πραξάντων, καὶ τῶν μὴ βαπτισθέντων καὶ ὁμοίως μηδὲν πραξάντων;"

"Ἀπόκρισις.

"Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ διαφορὰ τῶν βαπτισθέντων πρὸς τὰ μὴ βαπτισθέντα, τὸ τυχεῖν μὲν τὰ βαπτισθέντα τῶν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀγαθῶν τὰ δὲ μὴ βαπτισθέντα μὴ τυχεῖν. Ἀξιοῦνται δὲ

* Six Queries on Infant Baptism.

τῶν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀγαθῶν τῇ πίστει τῶν προσφερόντων ἀντὰ τῷ βαπτίσματι."

'QUESTION.

'Since children that die in infancy have no praise 'nor no blame from any thing that they have done, What 'difference will be made at the resurrection between such 'of them as have been, by the means of others, baptized, 'but have done nothing themselves, and such as have 'not been baptized, and have likewise done nothing?'

'ANSWER.

'This will be the difference between those that have 'been baptized, and those that have not: — That the 'baptized will be made partakers of the blessings granted 'by baptism, and the unbaptized not; and these bless-'ings of baptism are vouchsafed to them for the sake of 'the faith of those that bring them to baptism.'

He speaks of the case of unbaptized infants after the rate that most Greek writers do, viz. That they will lose all reward, without mentioning any positive punishment. This was the general opinion of the Christians of the Greek Church, That infants dying unbaptized would miss of Heaven, but not be under any positive punishment; as appears by the words of Gregory Nazianzen, cited before *, and as I shall more fully shew at another place †.

There is a spurious book ascribed to Athanasius, called *Quæstiones ad Antiochum*, which gives their opinion in this matter very particularly. Some quotations out of that book ought to have had a place here; but that it seems to have been written after our period, and, by ignorant men, crowded in among the works of Athanasius; but the following passage I recite, because of its affinity to the foregoing: —

* Ch. 11. † Part 2, ch. 6.

Quæst. ad Antiochum, Qu. 114.

"Πῦ ὑπάγουσι τὰ τελευτῶντα νήπια; εἰς κόλασιν, ἢ εἰς βασίλειαν; καὶ πῦ τὰ τῶν ἀπίστων νήπια; καὶ πῦ τὰ τῶν πιστῶν ἀβάπτιστα ἀποθνήσκοντα τάττονται; μετὰ τῶν πιστῶν, ἢ ἀπίστων;"

"Ἀπόκρισις.

"Τοῦ Κυρίου λέγοντος. Ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με, τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. Καὶ πάλιν τοῦ Ἀποστόλου φάσκοντος, Νῦν δὲ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἅγιά ἐστι, πρόδηλον ὅτι ὡς ἄσπιλα καὶ πιστὰ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰσέρχονται τὰ τῶν πιστῶν βεβαπτισμένα νήπια. Τὰ δὲ ἀβάπτιστα καὶ τὰ ἐθνικὰ οὔτε εἰς βασιλείαν εἰσέρχονται: ἀλλ' οὔτε πάλιν εἰς κόλασιν, ἁμαρτίαν γὰρ οὐκ ἔπραξαν."

'QUESTION.

'Whither do infants go when they die? — into 'punishment, or into the kingdom? — and particularly, 'Whither go the children of Heathens? — and, Where 'are placed the children of the faithful that die unbap-'tized? Are they placed with the believers, or with the 'unbelievers?'

'ANSWER.

'Inasmuch as our Lord says, *Suffer little children to 'come to me, for of such is the kingdom of Heaven.* 'And again, the apostle says *Now are your children holy* '[or saints]; it is plain that the children of believers do, 'if they be baptized, go as spotless and faithful into the 'kingdom: but those of them that are not baptized, do 'not enter the kingdom; as also neither do the children 'of unbelievers; but yet, neither, on the other side, do 'they go into torment, for they have committed no sin.'

They that would read any more of those spurious passages that are later than the year 400, but ascribed to authors before that time, and yet are not very scandalous, as being really within a century of it, or thereabouts, in which there happens to be mention of infant baptism, may have some of them in the said book.

Athanasii Quæstiones ad Antiochum, quæst. 2. *item qu.* 66. And also,

Athanasii Dicta et interpretatio Parabolarum Script. qu. 94; and more in books ascribed to St. Chrysostom, as St. Chrysostom in Psal. xiv, *One brings an infant to be baptized; presently the priest requires a covenant*, &c. *Idem Homilia de Adam et Eva.* Let us consider the meaning of what the Church all over the world practises in the baptizing of infants or adult persons, &c.

There is also commonly produced a passage, very ancient indeed, if one might rely upon it; an order of Hyginus, bishop of Rome [22.]; That in all baptisms there must be one [*Patrinus*] Godfather and one Godmother; but as this is of no credit for authenticity, having no voucher elder than Platina *, so also it does not necessarily relate to infants; for they had witnesses that are sometimes called *Patrini*, in the case of adult persons.

This sort of testimonies is better omitted; for, in any cause whatever, evidences of no good credit do more hurt than good.

---

* In Vita Hygini.

END OF VOL. I.

G. Auld, Printer, Greville Street, London.

RETURN TO **CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT**
202 Main Library

LOAN PERIOD 1 **HOME USE**	2	3
4	5	6

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS
1-month loans may be renewed by calling 642-3405
6-month loans may be recharged by bringing books to Circulation Desk
Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days prior to due date

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

MAR 29 1982 APR 20 2001

RET'D NOV 19 1981

REC. CIR. SEP 30 '82

INTERLIBRARY LOAN
FEB 3 1982
UNIV. OF CALIF., BERK.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
BERKELEY, CA 94720

FORM NO. DD8, 60m, 12/80